OXFORD

THE HISTORIAN'S CRAFT IN THE AGE OF HERODOTUS

Edited by

Nino Luraghi

THE HISTORIAN'S CRAFT IN THE AGE OF HERODOTUS

This page intentionally left blank

The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus

Edited by

NINO LURAGHI

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford OX2 6DP

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide in

Oxford New York
Athens Auckland Bangkok Bogotá Buenos Aires
Cape Town Chennai Dar es Salaam Delhi Florence Hong Kong Istanbul
Karachi Kolkata Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Mumbai
Nairobi Paris São Paulo Singapore Taipei Tokyo Toronto Warsaw

and associated companies in Berlin Ibadan

Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press
in the UK and in certain other countries

Published in the United States
by Oxford University Press Inc., New York

© The several contributors 2001

First published 2001
First published in paperback 2007

The moral rights of the authors have been asserted
Database right Oxford University Press (maker)

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press,
or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate
reprographics rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction
outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department,
Oxford University Press, at the address above

You must not circulate this book in any other binding or cover
and you must impose the same condition on any acquirer

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Data available

ISBN 978–0–19–924050–7 (Hbk.) 978–0–19–921511–9 (Pbk.)

Typeset by John Waś, Oxford
Printed in Great Britain
on acid-free paper by
Biddles Ltd., Guildford and King's Lynn

Acknowledgements

MOST of the essays that comprise this book derive from papers presented at the workshop 'The Dawn of Historiography', held in Turin at the beginning of September 1997, an event enormously facilitated by the organizational skills of Susanne Ebbinghaus (Oxford). The workshop itself was made possible by generous financial support from the Committee for Historical, Philosophical, and Philological Sciences of the Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche and by the Regione Piemonte. Both institutions, and in particular Dr Giampiero Leo, head of the Department of Culture of the Regione Piemonte, deserve my warmest gratitude. The funding also facilitated a complex process of editing, whose last stage was supported by the Loeb Fund of the Department of the Classics of Harvard University.

Oswyn Murray's essay 'Herodotus and Oral History' is republished by courtesy of the Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.

Although most authors have tried to keep their contributions up to date, the reader should bear in mind that the volume was first submitted to the publisher for consideration in September 1998.

In preparing this book for print I have incurred a series of debts. Rosemary Fleck (Rome), Matthias Haake (Freiburg), Judson Herrman (Harvard), and Philomene Probert and Jason Zerdin (both Oxford) helped me in different ways and at different stages. I hope they will be as pleased as I am at seeing the fruit of our efforts assuming its final shape. The Seminar für Alte Geschichte of the Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg has been my base of operation, and my colleagues there have been helpful in various ways, even in the period since I left Germany for the United States. On a different level, the lively academic environment of Freiburg has enormously influenced the elaboration of the conceptual framework of the workshop.

Since the time when I first discussed with him the possibility of organizing the workshop, in Oxford in March 1996, Oswyn Murray

has been a constant source of inspiration and advice. This whole volume is in a way a tribute to his scholarship.

N.L.

Cambridge, Mass., November 2000

Five years after the original publication, the decision of Oxford University Press to reissue this book in paperback has offered a welcome chance to correct a few typos and an occasion to think back to the project from which the book emerged. It is for the reader to judge whether or not the intention of offering a reasonably cohesive treatment of a consistent set of issues, centring especially on the relationship of early Greek historiography to orality, literacy, and oral tradition, has been successfully fulfilled. One of the goals pursued in the book was to bring together scholars who would not normally all write in the same language, let alone publish their works in the same book. In this sense at least, the book has achieved its purpose, and the availability of a paperback edition will further enhance this achievement. Otherwise, the success of this, as of any other work of scholarship, will be measured by the extent to which other scholars, or the authors themselves, will argue with, build upon, or surpass the ideas and thoughts of the authors.

N.L.

Freiburg im Breisgau, October 2006

Contents

Abbreviations ix

1. Introduction 1
NINO LURAGHI

2. Herodotus and Oral History 16
OSWYN MURRAY

3. Ancestors of Historiography in Early Greek Elegiac and Iambic Poetry? 45
EWEN L. BOWIE

4. Hecataeus: From Genealogy to Historiography 67
LUCIO BERTELLI

5. Early *Historiē* and Literacy 95
ROBERT L. FOWLER

6. Constructing the Past: Colonial Traditions and the Writing of History. The Case of Cyrene 116
MAURIZIO GIANGIULIO

7. Local Knowledge in Herodotus' *Histories* 138
NINO LURAGHI

8. Kissing Cousins: Some Curious Cases of Adjacent Material in Herodotus 161
ALAN GRIFFITHS

9. The Herodotean Picture of Themistocles: A Mirror of Fifth-century Athens 179
WOLFGANG BLÖSEL

10. Herodotus' *Histories* and the Floating Gap 198
ROSALIND THOMAS

11. Herodotus' Egypt and the Foundations of Universal History 211
PIETRO VANNICELLI

12. The Beginnings of Chronography: Hellanicus' *Hiereiai* 241
ASTRID MÖLLER

13. Thucydides' Archaeology: Between Epic and Oral Traditions 263
ROBERTO NICOLAI

14. Myth, History, and Collective Identity: Uses of the Past in Ancient Greece and Beyond 286
HANS-JOACHIM GEHRKE

15. Herodotus and Oral History Reconsidered 314
OSWYN MURRAY

Notes on Contributors 326

Index Locorum 329

General Index 337

Abbreviations

A&A	*Antike und Abendland*
A&R	*Atene e Roma*
AA	*Archäologischer Anzeiger*
AFLP	*Annali della Facoltà di Lettere dell'Università di Perugia*
AION	*Annali dell'Istituto Orientale di Napoli*
AIONarchstant	*Annali dell'Istituto Orientale di Napoli: Sezione di Archeologia e Storia Antica*
AJA	*American Journal of Archaeology*
AJPh	*American Journal of Philology*
AncSoc	*Ancient Society*
ANSMusN	*American Numismatic Society Museum Notes*
ASNP	*Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa—Classe di Scienze Morali*
ATL	B. D. Meritt, H. T. Wade-Gery, and M. F. McGregor (eds.), *The Athenian Tribute Lists* (Princeton, 1939–)
BCH	*Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*
CAH	*Cambridge Ancient History*
CJ	*Classical Journal*
ClAnt	*Classical Antiquity*
CQ	*Classical Quarterly*
CR	*Classical Review*
CS	*Critica storica*
DHA	*Dialogues d'histoire ancienne*
DK	H. Diels and W. Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, 8th edn. (Hamburg, 1957)
FGrHist	F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (Berlin, 1923–)
GP	B. Gentili and C. Prato, *Poetarum Elegiacorum Testimonia et Fragmenta*, 2nd edn. (Leipzig, 1988–)
GRBS	*Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*
HSCPh	*Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*
IG	*Inscriptiones Graecae Consilio et Auctoritate Academiae Borussicae Editae*
IM	*Istanbuler Mitteilungen*
IvM	O. Kern (ed.), *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Mäander* (Berlin, 1900)
JHS	*Journal of Hellenic Studies*

JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
JÖAI	*Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts in Wien*
JWCI	*Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*
LIMC	*Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* (Zurich, 1981–)
MD	*Materiali e discussioni per lo studio dei testi classici*
MGR	*Miscellanea greca e romana* (Rome, 1965–)
MH	*Museum Helveticum*
ML	R. Meiggs and D. M. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, 2nd edn. (Oxford, 1988)
MW	R. Merkelbach and M. L. West (eds.), *Fragmenta Hesiodea* (Oxford, 1967)
OGIS	W. Dittenberger (ed.), *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae* (Leipzig, 1905)
PCPhS	*Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*
PdP	*Parola del passato*
PRIMI	A. Vogliano (ed.), *Papiri della Regia Università di Milano*, i (Milan, 1937)
QS	*Quaderni di storia*
QUCC	*Quaderni urbinati di cultura classica*
RAC	*Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* (Stuttgart, 1950–)
RAL	*Rendiconti dell'Accademia dei Lincei*
RE	*Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*
RÉG	*Revue des études grecques*
RFIC	*Rivista di filologia e d'istruzione classica*
RhM	*Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*
RHR	*Revue de l'histoire des religions*
RSI	*Rivista storica italiana*
SCO	*Studi classici e orientali*
SEG	*Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*
SIFC	*Studi italiani di filologia classica*
SMEA	*Studi micenei ed egeo-anatolici*
SPAW	*Sitzungsberichte der preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*
TAPhA	*Transactions of the American Philological Association*
TrGF	*Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Göttingen, 1971–)
W	M. West, *Iambi et Elegi Graeci*, 2nd edn. (Oxford, 1992)
WJA	*Wiener Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft*
YCS	*Yale Classical Studies*
ZDMG	*Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*
ZPE	*Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*

I

Introduction

NINO LURAGHI

BEFORE leaving the reader to find her or his own way through the essays which compose this book, it might be useful to explain in a few lines how and why they came into being. The workshop they originate from was conceived as an attempt to improve our understanding of early Greek historiography from a specific viewpoint, that of its background in Greek culture and society. Oswyn Murray's seminal work on the relationship of Herodotus and oral tradition, reprinted here, was the starting-point for the definition of the set of questions which were initially posed to the participants in the workshop. In fact, Murray's interpretation of the *Histories* as a work based on oral tradition, rather than simply composed using oral sources, suggests new questions about the nature of such a work and about its embeddedness in the culture and society of its times. At the same time, it asks for further reflections on the role of the past and on the function of knowledge about the past in fifth-century Greece. The present collection of essays seeks to explore the perspectives opened by such an approach.

Therefore, this is not only a book on Herodotus, but also a study of the origins of Greek historiography. Rather than investigate what made Herodotus a unique figure in the history of historiography, most of the essays collected here focus on attitudes which Herodotus shared with his contemporaries, historians and others, and on aspects which make him a typical product of his time. This emphasis confronted us with a further choice. Herodotus' *Histories* are an account of past events and foreign lands and habits, and at the same time a critical enquiry, which may as such profitably be compared with the enquiries which were being carried out in Greece in the same period and in the most different fields by philosophers,

scientists, and other 'intellectuals'.[1] Although the latter problem, i.e. the cultural background of Herodotus' critical method, is surely both crucial and fascinating, and in fact turns up here and there in the pages which follow, the stress in this book lies rather on the former. In what forms was knowledge of the past transmitted and produced in late archaic and classical Greece, what role did the various forms of tradition—including poetry, both epic and other—play in this process, how did the early historians approach and process this traditional lore, which assumptions did they share with their audience regarding the nature and distribution of knowledge about the past? These are some of the questions tackled in the present book.

For this reason, the general function of the past in Greek society and special institutions connected with the preservation, transmission, and construction of the past are dealt with. Early Greek historiography, i.e. Herodotus' predecessors, contemporaries, and immediate followers, forms a central focus of the present book. Its aim is to contribute to the understanding of this chapter of Greek literature as a historical phenomenon, firmly anchored in Greek society. If many of the essays concentrate on Herodotus himself, they aim to look through his work as through a lens, in order to illustrate more general aspects of early Greek historiography, for which the *Histories* constitute after all the most important evidence. It is, however, our firm hope that, shedding some light on the context from which the *Histories* emerged, this collection of essays will also contribute to an improved understanding of the *Histories* themselves.

Given these premisses, it will come as no surprise that a set of questions which runs quite obviously through most of the book clusters around the respective functions and effects of orality and literacy in Greek society, particularly concerning the transmission and construction of knowledge about the past. Via the Homeric question, oral transmission has in fact been at home in the study of ancient Greek literature since the first century AD at the very latest,[2] but the use of orality as a category to interpret Greek culture

[1] As an example of this approach, see most recently R. Thomas, 'Performance and Written Publication in Herodotus and the Sophistic Generation', in W. Kullmann and J. Althoff (eds.), *Vermittlung und Tradierung von Wissen in der griechischen Kultur* (Tübingen, 1993), 225–44, and 'Ethnography, Proof and Argument in Herodotus' *Histories*', *PCPhS* 43 (1997), 128–48.

[2] The idea that the Homeric poems had been initially transmitted by word of

has become a distinctive feature of classical studies only in recent decades. Building upon the pioneering researches of Milman Parry and heavily drawing on comparative evidence from different cultures, the studies focused on the opposition literacy–orality have brought about crucial progress in our understanding of Greek poetry.[3] This 'oral revolution', still in full swing, seems now to have reached a mature phase, thanks to a further broadening of cultural comparanda[4] and the recourse to a more sophisticated approach, which pays attention to the medial and conceptional aspects of the alternative oral–written.[5] However, the 'oral revolution' in Greek literature followed different paths in the fields of poetry and prose, and it is only in very recent times that the mutual importance of the conclusions reached in either field has been increasingly perceived.

The study of Greek historiography experienced its own separate 'oral revolution' with some delay and, up to now, on a somewhat smaller scale than that experienced by archaic poetry, especially epic. The pioneering role has here been played by Oswyn Murray's essay, first published in 1987, which opens the present collection. Murray's application to Greek historiography of the methodology of research on oral tradition originally developed by historians of

mouth and only much later collected and written down appears first in Flavius Josephus, *Contra Apionem* 1. 12, but must go back to Hellenistic (Pergamene?) philology. Josephus played an important part in F. A. Wolf's 'Homeric revolution': see F. A. Wolf, *Prolegomena to Homer, 1795*, translated with introduction and notes by A. Grafton, G. W. Most, and J. E. G. Zetzel (Princeton, 1985), 94–5.

[3] For differently oriented surveys see J. P. Holoka, 'Homer, Oral Poetry Theory, and Comparative Literature: Major Trends and Controversies in Twentieth-century Criticism', in J. Latacz (ed.), *Zweihundert Jahre Homer-Forschung: Rückblick und Ausblick* (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1991), 456–81; R. Thomas, *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge, 1992), 29–51; J. M. Foley, 'Oral Tradition and its Implications', in I. Morris and B. Powell (eds.), *A New Companion to Homer* (Leiden, New York, and Cologne, 1997), 146–73. On the oral-formulaic theory and its development see J. M. Foley, *The Theory of Oral Composition: History and Methodology* (Bloomington, Ind., 1988).

[4] This broadening of horizons is exemplified by the foundation in 1986, under the direction of John Miles Foley, of a journal named *Oral Tradition* devoted to the study of orality, oral poetry, and oral tradition in all cultures.

[5] See E. J. Bakker, *Poetry in Speech: Orality and Homeric Discourse* (Ithaca, NY, and London, 1997), and the contributions collected in E. J. Bakker and A. Kahane (eds.), *Written Voices, Spoken Signs: Tradition, Performance, and the Epic Text* (Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1997). For the theoretical framework of the distinction between the medial and the conceptional aspect of literacy and orality, see P. Koch and W. Oesterreicher, 'Sprache der Nähe—Sprache der Distanz: Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit im Spannungsfeld von Sprachtheorie und Sprachgeschichte', *Romanistisches Jahrbuch*, 36 (1985), 15–43.

Central Africa is without doubt one of the most promising trends in Herodotean scholarship after the Second World War—the *terminus* is not chosen at random, as will become clear in a moment. But fully to understand the scope of Murray's contribution, and to show in which direction it may most fruitfully be developed, it is necessary to explain why oral-tradition research has been brought to bear on the problem of the origins of Greek historiography in just this way and not otherwise. Any step further from the place where we are now requires that we understand clearly how we got here—and the path which brought us here started in Berlin, in the first years of our century.

Generally speaking, if one should name the moment and the place which played the most important role in the formation of our views of Greek historiography—excluding Byzantium in the age of Photius, a candidate on material grounds, so to speak—the choice would almost inevitably fall on the Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität of Berlin between the last years of the nineteenth century and the first years of the twentieth. Hermann Diels was Ordinarius of Classical Philology at this university when in 1896 Felix Jacoby, aged 20, moved there to complete his studies. One year later Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff also moved to Berlin, to occupy a chair as Ordinarius of Rhetoric, and immediately started a seminar together with Diels. Jacoby was to gain his doctoral degree under the guidance of Diels, but in the preface to his dissertation, printed in 1902, he acknowledges Wilamowitz as his 'zweiter Lehrer'. The influence of both scholars is unmistakably recognizable in all of his subsequent work. It is not idle curiosity to recall these facts. In the interaction of these three gigantic personalities, Diels, Wilamowitz, and Jacoby, lie the roots of some fundamental assumptions which underpin the studies on the origins and early development of Greek historiography up to our day.[6]

In 1908, just a few years after completing his doctorate, Jacoby delivered a paper at the International Congress of Historical Sciences in Berlin,[7] describing his plan for the edition of the fragments

[6] Informative profiles of them are to be found in W. W. Briggs, Jr., and W. M. Calder III (eds.), *Classical Scholarship: A Biographical Encyclopedia* (New York and London, 1990), respectively by M. Chambers (Felix Jacoby), 205–10, R. L. Fowler (Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff), 489–522, and E. Schütrumpf (Hermann Diels), 52–60.

[7] 'Über die Entwicklung der griechischen Historiographie und den Plan einer neuen Sammlung der griechischen Historikerfragmente', originally published in

of the lost Greek historians—an enterprise which was to be his main concern for the next fifty years! In this paper he delineated with astonishing lucidity the guidelines of the interpretation of the development of Greek historiography which would underlie the collection. The paper is crucial for the understanding of the whole of Jacoby's scholarly achievement, and especially of the *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. The latter cannot in fact be considered a collection of fragments in the sense in which, for instance, the *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* are. In their arrangement, logical rather than catalogic, the *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* reflect with small modifications Jacoby's conception of the development of Greek historiography as he had sketched it in his 1908 paper. Indispensable as they are as a research tool, Jacoby's *Fragmente*, with their *Kommentare* growing longer and longer from volume to volume, are actually something quite different: they are the biggest part of Jacoby's *Lebenswerk*, the colossal torso of a monumental history of Greek historiography, of which *Atthis*, published in 1949 and originally conceived as an introduction to a volume of the fragments,[8] and the numerous entries in Pauly–Wissowa, especially the article 'Herodotos', form integral parts. None of these parts can be adequately understood in isolation from the others.

Two aspects of Jacoby's evolutionist theory of Greek historiography are particularly relevant here. First of all, his idea of Herodotus quite literally carrying the evolution of historiography further from where Hecataeus had left it: according to Jacoby, Herodotus began in the tradition of Ionic geo-ethnographical research, critically investigating the habits and traditions of the non-Greeks, and only afterwards realized the epoch-making importance of the Persian wars and turned to history proper. In this new enterprise he had no predecessors: for Jacoby, Herodotus' ontogeny, from ethnogeographer to historian, was at the same tame the phylogeny of Greek historiography. It was only after the *Histories* had appeared that Greek communities which did not figure very prominently in Herodotus' work realized that *their* history too was interesting, and deserved to be put in a better light than Herodotus had done:

Klio, 9 (1909), 80–123, and republished in *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtsschreibung*, ed. H. Bloch (Leiden, 1956), 16–64.

[8] See M. Chambers, 'The Genesis of Jacoby's *Atthis*', in E. M. Craik (ed.), *'Owls to Athens': Essays on Classical Subjects Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover* (Oxford, 1990), 381–90.

according to Jacoby, local historiography was born under the stimulus of and as a reaction to Herodotus' panhellenic, or 'great', historiography. The severe logic of this evolutionist scheme led Jacoby, *inter alia*, to harass the chronology of some fifth-century historians, in order to make them fit into his system and preserve Herodotus' splendid isolation. On this point, Jacoby's enormous influence is shown by the fact that, notwithstanding criticism of details such as the downdating of Charon of Lampsacus, the scholarship after the Second World War—with no influential exception—has studied Herodotus' *Histories* as an isolated phenomenon, confronting them with Presocratic philosophers rather than with other early historians.[9]

A second aspect of Jacoby's reconstruction of the rise of Greek historiography is more obviously relevant to the studies collected in the present volume. Jacoby not only isolated Herodotus from colleagues or models, apart, of course, from Hecataeus; he also severed him from written sources in general, fiercely fighting the theory that Greek historiography was in any way heir to pre-literary registrations of past events, possibly kept by priests or otherwise in a religious milieu. Although the second point is clearly linked to the former, Jacoby seems to have developed it relatively late, in connection with his work on the Atthidographers. In *Atthis* the main target of his polemic was Wilamowitz, who, in the wake of the discovery of the *Athenaiōn Politeia*, had argued in *Aristoteles und Athen* that local historical traditions in Greece, generally based on ancestral documentary traditions, had crystallized in local chronicles by the late archaic age and became sources for fifth-century historiography. Jacoby lucidly underlined that Wilamowitz was in part imposing a Roman model on Greek historiography, as is shown by the latter's idea of the existence of 'eine wirkliche attische annalistik', a model obviously connected with Mommsen's ideas about the Roman *annales pontificum*.[10] Jacoby's devastating criticism of this theory, of breathtaking amplitude and with bewildering richness in detail, occupies the 400 pages of his *Atthis* (including some 175 pages of endnotes). Here Jacoby repeated and refined his ideas on Herodotus' oral sources, the *logioi andres*, or learned men of any

[9] R. L. Fowler's article 'Herodotos and his Contemporaries', *JHS* 116 (1996), 62–87, represents as a matter of fact a welcome novelty.

[10] U. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, *Aristoteles und Athen* (2 vols.; Berlin, 1893), esp. i. 282 for the 'attische annalistik'. For Jacoby's criticism see *Atthis* (Oxford, 1949), esp. 53 and 344 nn. 93 and 94.

single community, who handed over to the historians their knowledge of the past.[11]

Positively as well as negatively, Jacoby's work shows clear influences of both of his mentors. If the confrontation with Wilamowitz lies more obviously at the surface, Diels's role must not be undervalued either. Diels is the scholar who made of the Presocratic philosophers a field accessible to research, collecting and ordering their fragments. It comes as no surprise that he praised Hecataeus over Herodotus, although his description of Herodotus as a 'weak and yielding spirit' who was dominated by his predecessor is somewhat hard to accept.[12] Be that as it may, Diels's *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* were admittedly a model for Jacoby, and his decision to order the authors according to an *entwicklungsgeschichtliches Prinzip* owes much to Diels's example. The same might be said of the crucial role Jacoby assigned to Hecataeus.

In a sense, one has the impression that Jacoby's lasting contribution to the early stages of Greek historiography is in many points destructive rather than constructive, being in several cases more important for the interpretations it eliminated than for those it put forward. This is true at least of its effects: Herodotus' isolation and direct connection to Hecataeus, the absence of an earlier tradition of written recording of past events, and most of all the development of the various branches of fifth-century historiography as fixed by Jacoby are unquestioned and often hardly conscious assumptions of most Herodotean research after the Second World War. Only few voices were raised to question Jacoby's system, with limited success.[13] The Nazi persecution, which caused Jacoby to

[11] As a matter of fact, Jacoby's disagreement with Wilamowitz had been explicit from the beginning, as may be seen in his 1909 paper: see *Klio*, 9: 112–14 = *Abhandlungen*, 52–4 (esp. the footnotes, as so often with Jacoby). On the other hand, between 1909 and 1949 Jacoby had grown even more sceptical as to the genuineness of eponymous lists for the archaic age; compare *Atthis*, 353 n. 3, with *Klio*, 9: 111 n. 92 = *Abhandlungen*, 50 n. 92. The *logioi andres* appear already in 'Herodotos', *RE* suppl. ii (1913), 205–520 at 392 ff., but they feature most prominently in *Atthis*, 215–25.

[12] H. Diels, 'Herodot und Hekataios', *Hermes*, 22 (1887), 411–44; the characterization of Herodotus ('eine weiche, nachgiebige Seele') at 426. Diels's words on Hecataeus are echoed by Jacoby, 'Hekataios', *RE* vii/2 (1912), 2667–750 at 2675, line 32.

[13] R. Drews, *The Greek Accounts of Eastern History* (Washington, 1973), 36–9, has some thoughtful remarks on Jacoby's system. His own solution, however, is still rather strictly dependant on Jacoby (e.g. as regards the development of Greek local historiography after Herodotus).

leave Germany for Oxford and to publish *Atthis* in English, opened his work to Anglo-Saxon scholarship at large. Aside from generally accepting the negative results of Jacoby's analysis, however, very few scholars really sought to build upon them and to develop them further.

A notable exception was Arnaldo Momigliano. In a series of articles published between the fifties and the seventies he developed Jacoby's points in various directions. For him, who took into account Herodotus the historian of Egypt and the Near East far more than Jacoby did, Herodotus' neglect of written sources—like Thucydides'—was not a material constraint dictated by the absence of written records, but rather a cultural option. Herodotus' choice was to remain typical of the mainstream of Greek political historiography, opposing it to the Jewish historical tradition on the one side, and to Greek antiquarian tradition on the other, that is, to a tradition of historical writing characterized by a systematic approach to the past, by a much broader range of interest than Thucydidean political historiography was ready to face, and by a completely different and much more positive approach to written records.[14] Still more interestingly, Momigliano was perhaps the only scholar to realize that Jacoby's cogent argument against written sources called for a radically new appreciation of Herodotus' method: 'Herodotus' success in touring the world and handling oral traditions is something exceptional by any standard—something we are not yet in a position to explain fully. The secrets of his workshop are not yet all out.'[15] Finally, in a time in which orality was not yet fashionable among ancient historians, Momigliano insisted on the importance of taking into account the fact that ancient audiences would mostly experience the historical text as something heard rather than read.[16]

Momigliano's contribution to the history of Greek historiography

[14] A. Momigliano, *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1990), offers a convenient introduction to Momigliano's thought on ancient historiography, with some references to his articles. See esp. 29–53 on the attitude of Greek historians towards written sources.

[15] 'The Place of Herodotus in the History of Historiography', *History*, 43 (1958), 1–13, here quoted from A. Momigliano, *Secondo contributo alla storia degli studi classici* (Rome, 1960), 32. Momigliano's interpretation of Herodotus' role as the initiator of Greek historiography (see ibid. 31: 'There was no Herodotus before Herodotus') is clearly linked to Jacoby's position, although Momigliano rather de-emphasized Hecataeus' role.

[16] e.g. A. Momigliano, 'The Historians of the Classical World and their Audiences: Some Suggestions', *ASNP* 8 (1978), 59–75.

is of course much more complex than this, but there is no point in rehearsing it here. What is relevant to the present reflections is Momigliano's development of some of Jacoby's fundamental assumptions. The works of Momigliano represent the channel, as it were, through which Jacoby's questions reached the seventies and eighties not only in their destructive aspects, but also with their potential for further constructive developments. It comes as no surprise that Oswyn Murray's study of Herodotus and oral tradition originated in a seminar delivered together with Momigliano.

In order to appreciate the progress represented by Murray's essay, it is important to stress one point. Jacoby already used the expression 'oral tradition' to indicate the way in which information about the archaic age had reached Herodotus, and Momigliano followed him in doing so. Neither of them, however, did very much in the way of explaining what they meant by this expression, or how these 'oral traditions' were actually to be conceived. In fact, it might be possible that Jacoby, especially in *Atthis*, had in mind the work on oral traditions behind the Gospels, which had been carried out by German theologians in the first decades of this century. As far as I know, however, he never explicitly referred to this possible model.[17] In the first half of this century, 'oral tradition' for him could hardly be more than a formula, a declaration of ignorance as it were, rather than a reference to a well-known historical phenomenon.

As a matter of fact, oral tradition was not at the centre of historical interest up to recent times. Although historians seem always to have been aware that not everything people claim to know about the past comes from books or records, they also knew that written evidence is more trustworthy. If they had to write on any aspect of the past of a group, they would usually look for the nearest archive rather than question the group's members. However, archives themselves are anything but neutral: the documents have their own perspective, i.e. that of the people whose rights they establish, and often that of central institutions. A more peripheral view of history, which

[17] Unlike Eduard Schwartz, Jacoby does not show any interest in New Testament studies (and anyway, not even Schwartz seems to have taken into account the possibility of extending the methodology of form-criticism to classical literature; he rather tried to do the opposite, i.e. to apply the methods of classical philology to the New Testament). For a complete introduction to this methodology, whose utility for classical studies would deserve some research, see K. Berger, *Einführung in die Formgeschichte* (Tübingen, 1987).

concentrates on the perspectives of individuals and groups further away from the centre—of power, economy, and so on—drove the historians' attention to a different kind of knowledge about the past, more ambiguous, to be sure, but also less likely to reflect an institutional perspective; a kind of knowledge which was far more likely to be transmitted by word of mouth than to be fixed in texts or documents of whatever sort. Historians met similar problems when they turned to lands and periods for which no written sources were available. Unless they were ready to admit that, say, in equatorial Africa everything of importance had happened after the conversion to Islam or the arrival of the Europeans, historians had to develop methods of treating this rather intractable sort of knowledge, oral tradition. In sum, it was the will to investigate areas of history for which only oral sources were available—a will in many ways connected with decolonization and with the general political trends after the Second World War—that confronted historians with the need to assess and process knowledge about the past transmitted by word of mouth.

Generally speaking, research on oral traditions and oral literature has enormously enriched post-Second World War historiography in terms of ideas and methods. In the particular case of the origins of Greek historiography, it also gave the decisive impulse which allowed Murray to go beyond Jacoby and Momigliano. It was especially Vansina's celebrated handbook, *De la tradition orale*,[18] which offers a very systematic and highly abstract classification of oral traditions together with general explanations of their functioning, that provided the basis for Murray's scrutiny of Herodotus from a new point of view, leading to the recognition in the *Histories* of general structural features of oral traditions. In the end, it seemed, it could be demonstrated that Herodotus had not misrepresented his sources: the sort of knowledge about the past which was to be found in his work actually looked as it should, if it had been transmitted for some generations by word of mouth rather than in the form of fixed texts.

Successive work on orality and oral tradition in Greece has shown that the path taken by Murray was a fruitful one.[19] The question is rather how to go further. At a first glance, one might argue that

[18] Original edition Tervuren, 1961; English translation as *Oral Tradition* (Harmondsworth, 1965).

[19] e.g. Thomas, *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece* [n. 3], 108–13.

with the help of Vansina's empirically based model of oral tradition Murray simply confirmed Jacoby's and Momigliano's position. But in fact the application of oral-tradition research to early Greek historiography opened up a series of new problems. If what Herodotus tells about late archaic and early classical Greek history amounts to a collection of oral traditions of the various communities—or rather, perhaps, of the various polities—then it must also be admitted that such knowledge had been subject during its transmission to all the general rules of oral traditions as delineated by Vansina, and particularly to the one whereby any tradition is passed on only in so far as it fulfils a function in the group passing it on. In other words, Murray's approach required historians to consider the problem of the social dimension and distribution of the knowledge about the past which Herodotus had been able to collect. Furthermore, the specific mechanisms of the transmission of such knowledge in Greek society had to be investigated. And lastly, there was the problem of Herodotus himself: where did his art as a storyteller come from?

In his answer to this last question, it seems to me that Murray was in part still conditioned by his own tradition, that of Jacoby and Momigliano. Murray depicts Herodotus as the last of the Herodoti, so to speak, that is, as the last representative of a tradition of oral storytellers, 'who transcended his forerunners by moulding into a unity the traditional tales of his art, and ensured its disappearance by collecting and writing them down in relation to a new and greater theme—the last and greatest of the *logopoioi* by virtue of being a *logographos*'. Now, in spite of Murray's agreement with Wolfgang Aly's work on Herodotus as the exponent of a tradition of folk narrative, the unique role Herodotus is assigned by Murray is in a sense a new version of Herodotus' splendid isolation created by Jacoby.[20] One reason why Murray had to make of Herodotus the terminator of the storytelling tradition to which he belonged is of course that in fifth- and fourth-century Greece, when the documentation becomes a bit less scanty, no clear traces can be found of people who would conform to Murray's pre-Herodotean storytellers. On

[20] W. Aly, *Volksmärchen, Sage und Novelle bei Herodot und seinen Zeitgenossen* (Göttingen, 1921; repr. with appendix 1969). As a matter of fact, Aly does not assign a leading role to Herodotus. Notice that in Murray, less interested in the development of philosophy than Jacoby was, Hecataeus plays no important role as Herodotus' predecessor (one has the impression that the decline of Hecataeus had already begun with Momigliano).

the other hand, Murray was certainly right to point to the problem of the relationship between early Greek historiography and folk narrative, which has not been treated in any depth since Aly. Now, research in the field of folk literature has made substantial progress since 1914; to mention just a particularly conspicuous point, in his attempt to apply to Herodotus the methodology of motif research Aly could not yet count on the enormous classificatory works of Aanti Arne and Stith Thompson.[21] Furthermore, some of Aly's central assumptions as regards folk literature have been questioned thereafter, both on a general and on a particular level.[22] The study of Herodotean narrative in the framework of folk-narrative research is surely one of the fields where Murray's insights could be most profitably developed.

In this connection it is necessary to stress that the parallels with purely oral cultures should not be pressed too far. Apart from the analogies pointed out by Murray, the study of historical knowledge in such cultures is more likely to show differences than further parallels with Greece; after all, Greek culture, far from being a purely oral one, was exceptionally literate. Awareness of the risk of importing features from other contexts for lack of documentation on the Greek side is essential. This problem is made clear by Evans's attempt at explaining the origins of Greek historiography almost exclusively by African parallels. His transformation of Herodotus into a *griot* is a memorable example of the danger of transposing elements of one culture into another.[23] Evans's Greek *griots* are an answer to the same problem which also faced Murray, i.e. the

[21] S. Thompson, *Motif-index of Folk Literature* (Bloomington, Ind., 1989); A. Aarne and S. Thompson, *The Types of the Folk-tale*, 2nd edn. (Helsinki, 1961).

[22] *General*: Aly still applies romantic arguments and thought-patterns to the problem of folk literature (e.g. p. 208: 'influential are only those authors whom the people [das Volk] recognizes as blood of its blood'), deriving ultimately from the works of the brothers Grimm, with their highly idiosyncratic ideas about what is folk art and what is not; see H. Gerndt, 'Sagen und Sagenforschung im Spannungsfeld von Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit', *Fabula*, 29 (1988), 1–20 with further bibliography. *Particular*: contrary to what Aly thought, framed tales are today seen as typical of written works rather than folklore oral narrative; see S. Belcher, 'Framed Tales in the Oral Tradition: An Exploration', *Fabula*, 35 (1994), 1–19. This point is particularly relevant because Aly (pp. 88–9) interpreted Herodotus' weaving together of many different tales in the framework of the history of the Persian wars as an example of framed narrative, and in turn saw in this structure one more sign of Herodotus' belonging to a tradition of folk narrative.

[23] J. A. S. Evans, *Herodotus, Explorer of the Past: Three Essays* (Princeton, 1991), 89–146.

problem of Herodotus' predecessors and colleagues, but, I would argue, an answer sought in the wrong direction. Murray has shown how much new light the study of oral tradition in different cultures can throw upon Greek culture, and the best thing to do now is probably to go back to the record on fifth-century Greece and see in detail how our appreciation of it is modified by these new insights. In my opinion, it is necessary to go back to Jacoby, so to speak, to see how oral-tradition research may be brought to bear on the general problem of knowledge about the past in late archaic and classical Greece and on early Greek historiography, in all its complexity. By the way, one motive for doing so is that the record itself has not remained unchanged since Jacoby's times. The new fragments of Simonides' elegy for Plataea, and the crop of studies brought forth by their discovery, have significantly changed the pattern, showing that not even for the recent past can historiography and poetry be neatly distinguished from each other from the viewpoint of their subject-matter. Rather, poems like the Plataea elegy, far from being *sensu stricto* sources for historiography—for which they had not enough detail—presumably contributed to the formation of the ideas on the past, the *cadres sociaux* which structured the sort of knowledge collected by the historians.[24]

Another reason why further reflection is called for is that oral-tradition research has itself gone a long way from Vansina's 1961 book, which underlies Murray's essay.[25] Vansina himself has completely rewritten his handbook, and the new version diverges from the former in many points, which in their turn reflect general trends in the research.[26] The first version of Vansina's book, and works associated with it, have been severely criticized by most anthropologists. As a matter of fact, Vansina had vindicated to the historians, as evidence about the past, exactly the sort of lore and traditions which

[24] The meaning of the 'new Simonides' for 5th-cent. historiography is just beginning to be appreciated; see D. Boedeker, 'Simonides on Plataea: Narrative Elegy, Mythodic History', *ZPE* 107 (1995), 226–9; id., 'Heroic Historiography: Simonides and Herodotus on Plataea', *Arethusa*, 29 (1996), 237–42, repr. in D. Boedeker and D. Sider (eds.), *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire* (Oxford, 2001), 120–34; and Bowie's contribution to this volume.

[25] By the way, although Murray made clear that he used (and preferred) the first version of Vansina's book, it is fair to observe that his essay shows awareness of problems which figure more prominently in the second version and in general in works of the late seventies and early eighties (e.g. the creative force of oral tradition and its tendency to reflect the present state of society); cf. below and nn. 27 and 29.

[26] J. Vansina, *Oral Tradition as History* (Madison, 1985).

anthropologists, especially functionalists, had become accustomed to use as a mirror of the structures of the culture they were studying.[27] The anthropologists' challenge imposed upon historians the task of revising and refining their assumptions about the meaning of traditions and the instruments they used to distil evidence about the past from oral traditions. In the meantime, anthropologists have themselves become increasingly aware that traditions about the past cannot be treated as a simple mirror of the present, and that no society renews its past every day to keep it in accord with its present.[28] The new version of Vansina's book is a result of this fruitful confrontation. Apart from being much more alert to the creative ability of oral tradition, Vansina now de-emphasizes the gap between purely oral societies and societies using writing, pointing to common features in the field of the social function of the past.[29] On the other hand, he also partly renounces what Fentress and Wickham have called a 'textual model of memory', stressing that not all knowledge which a group considers to be relevant is codified in more or less fixed oral texts.

Vansina's new development runs parallel with the stronger integration of oral-tradition research in the general field of social history which has characterized this last decade. After the pioneering studies of Maurice Halbwachs on collective memory, the topic has been revived, in the light of the research on oral tradition, particularly by James Fentress and Chris Wickham and by Jan Assmann.[30] Assmann has investigated the social function and structure of memory in ancient cultures, stressing the difference in quality and func-

[27] On this see esp. J. C. Miller, 'Listening for the African Past', in id. (ed.), *The African Past Speaks: Essays on Oral Tradition and History* (Folkestone and Hamden, Conn., 1980), 44–52. A fine example of the 'second generation' of research on oral tradition as a source about the past is P. Irwin, *Liptako Speaks: History from Oral Tradition in Africa* (Princeton, 1981); the opening of the 'Conclusions', p. 162, is particularly telling: 'One man who read this book in manuscript considered it an attempt to sabotage the strongest thrust of methodological innovation in Africanist history—the reconstruction of the past from oral tradition.'

[28] For a critique of functionalism see esp. C. Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York, 1973).

[29] This development, incidentally, was already foreshadowed by the parallel study of genealogies in literate and oral cultures in D. Henige, *The Chronology of Oral Tradition: Quest for a Chimera* (Oxford, 1974), a book whose scope is much wider than the title would suggest.

[30] See respectively J. Fentress and C. Wickham, *The Social Memory* (Oxford, 1992), and J. Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen* (Munich, 1992).

tion between the relatively unstructured memory of the recent past (*kommunikatives Gedächtnis*) and memory of the distant past, highly formalized and forming the cultural code of each society (*kulturelles Gedächtnis*). Fentress and Wickham have de-emphasized the divide between societies transmitting knowledge about the past in a purely oral way and societies which use writing to this end, insisting that shared knowledge about the past, i.e. the sort of knowledge which forms part of group identity, would circulate mostly orally even in societies which use writing. On the other hand, further research in the field of oral tradition has built a more rigorous methodology for its collecting and processing, insisting upon the specific characteristics of oral texts and on the necessity of understanding them in terms of genre.[31] One might argue that Vansina's unitary perspective has split into two streams—to be sure connected with each other—viz. the study of group memory as a social phenomenon and the study of 'oracy', as oral literature is now called.

These developments are relevant for the origins of Greek historiography. Pre-Herodotean knowledge about the past needs to be investigated both in its social and in its literary aspects. Social knowledge about the past is not transmitted in the same way in all cultures, and the problems of Herodotus' predecessors and literary models on the one hand, and of the provenance and nature of his knowledge on the other, should in part be kept separate from each other. Rather than being interpreted as clues to his sources, his attitudes towards oral and written knowledge should be seen in the wider framework of fifth-century Greek culture, with its peculiar and fast-changing mix of orality and literacy. Herodotus' embeddedness in his social and literary context still deserves reflection.

[31] See E. Tonkin, *Narrating Our Pasts: The Social Construction of Oral History* (Cambridge, 1992), 1–17, 51–65, and R. Finnegan, *Oral Traditions and the Verbal Arts: A Guide to Research Practices* (London and New York, 1992), 135–57.

2

Herodotus and Oral History

OSWYN MURRAY

I

IT is generally agreed that Herodotus gathered most of his information from oral traditions. Even those who doubt this accept that he sought to represent his sources as oral, whether he was inventing them[1] or describing them as oral when in fact they were written: 'throughout the Histories Herodotus maintains the fiction that his work is an oral account, even where we know or surmise it to be based on written sources'.[2] Since it seems to me that a generalized view that Herodotus sought to misrepresent the nature of his sources raises more difficult problems than it solves,[3] I propose to ignore such approaches, and confine myself to investigating the consequences of the generally accepted version of Herodotus' sources. One consequence of this consensus has been to direct research on Herodotus away from source criticism in general, and

[This paper was originally published in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg and A. Kuhrt (eds.), *Achaemenid History*, ii. *The Greek Sources* (Leiden, 1987), 93–115, and is reprinted with kind permission of the Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten. Additions to the original version are put in square brackets.] The first draft of section 1 of this paper was written for a seminar given by myself and Professor Arnaldo Momigliano in Oxford in Hilary Term 1977; it was later discussed with anthropologists and classical scholars on a number of occasions, before being presented at the Groningen workshop. As it represents the theoretical underpinning of my *Early Greece* (Brighton, 1980) (see briefly pp. 27–32 = 22–8 of the 2nd edn., 1993), it was perhaps time it was published. Section II was written in the light of the Groningen discussions. Thanks are due to my colleagues there, and to David Asheri and Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg, who made valuable comments on the paper in its later stages.

[1] D. Fehling, *Herodotus and his 'Sources': Citation, Invention and Narrative Art* (Leeds, 1989), esp. 152 ff.

[2] H. R. Immerwahr, *Form and Thought in Herodotus* (Cleveland, 1966), 6.

[3] See n. 28.

towards questions centred on Herodotus as an author, his conception of history, his aims, and his literary techniques.[4] Neglect of the general problems of Herodotus' sources was perhaps a virtue so long as the principles of *Quellenforschung*, suitable only to certain literary historians, were liable to be applied. But it appears somewhat odd in the present age, when the problems of oral history and the characteristics, general and individual, of oral traditions are so widely debated, among both contemporary local historians and various other groups for 'radical history',[5] and even more among anthropologists. Not surprisingly, such historians and anthropologists have felt the need to evaluate the reliability of one of their main sources of information. For outsiders, until recently the difficulty has been that the insights gained were scattered in the specialist literature, and often not easily detachable from their precise context. But two works of synthesis have made much easier the task I want to approach in this paper, that of comparing Herodotus' treatment of Greek oral traditions with the characteristics of other oral traditions, in the hope of being able to clarify both the nature of Greek oral traditions and the contribution of Herodotus himself. Before confronting the problems of Herodotus' accounts of non-Greek cultures, it seems to me important first to establish principles in the less uncertain area of Greek tradition; but the second part of my paper attempts to show how my results are directly relevant to Herodotus' means of acquiring information on such cultures, by taking as an example his account of Persia.

The two modern works from which my investigation begins both stem from experience of African oral tradition, but it does not seem to me that this limitation has affected their relevance to early Greece; in fact one recompense for the extensive use I have made of them and their sources may be in confirming that their modes of approach are indeed more generally valid. The first and most

[4] The neglect of oral history is well revealed by the (admittedly impressionistic) survey of Guy Lachenaud, 'Les études hérodotéennes de l'avant-guerre à nos jours', *Storia della storiografia*, 7 (1985), 6–27. I have found especially valuable in the present context Immerwahr, *Form and Thought in Herodotus* [n. 2]; Simon Pembroke, 'Women in Charge', *JWCI* 30 (1967), 1–35; François Hartog, *Le Miroir d'Hérodote* (Paris, 1980); Mabel L. Lang, *Herodotean Narrative and Discourse* (Cambridge, Mass., 1984). I have not seen J. A. S. Evans, 'Oral Tradition in Herodotus', *Canadian Oral History Association Journal*, 4 (1980); but there are some excellent brief remarks in his *Herodotus* (Boston, 1982), ch. 10.

[5] A useful introduction to this is in Paul Thompson, *The Voice of the Past* (Oxford, 1978); see also David Henige, *Oral Historiography* (London, 1982).

obviously relevant of these works does itself claim to offer universal rules, although its author's experience as an oral historian was at that time limited to the Congo; this is Jan Vansina's *Oral Tradition*.[6] It offers a highly theoretical account of the various types of oral tradition and the problems of writing history from them; perhaps it is a sufficient indication of both its strengths and its weaknesses to say that it bears much the same relationship to the actual problems of oral history as Paul Maas's *Textual Criticism* does to the problems of editing a real text. The second book may be compared with Pasquali's response to Maas: it is Ruth Finnegan's *Oral Literature in Africa* (1970), a critical survey of the characteristics and types of African oral literature in general, and the problems related to the understanding of this literature.[7] It is perhaps important to the historian that both these books are empirical in their method, and based on the work of field anthropologists: they neither demand interpretation within nor offer obvious support for more abstract anthropological theories. Of course, as with most firmly based empirical studies, much of what they say leads to conclusions which may already seem obvious from study of the Greek evidence; but I hope that even the obvious and well-known facts of early Greek tradition will appear different in this wider context.

The last systematic attempt to confront this aspect of Herodotus with anthropology was W. Aly's *Volksmärchen, Sage und Novelle bei Herodot und seinen Zeitgenossen* (1921; repr. with appendix Göttingen, 1969). As is natural in a work of that date, Aly was primarily concerned with the methods and compilations of the folklorists; and many of his conclusions are so extreme that (despite Ludwig Huber's claims for its central position in modern Herodotus research)[8] the work has in fact been generally rejected, or passed over as of specialist interest only: in Kurt von Fritz's *Griechische Geschichtsschreibung* (1967), for instance, it is referred to only in the notes and then only for folk motifs. Some of the conclusions of this paper in fact bear a considerable resemblance to ideas of Aly—for instance, his distinction between *historiē* and *logos* is related to the two types of tradition I have postulated; and he too laid emphasis

[6] First published as *De la tradition orale* (Tervuren, 1961), English trans. Harmondsworth, 1965; I have used the Penguin edition of 1973, with important new observations in the preface.

[7] See also her *Oral Poetry* (Cambridge, 1977).

[8] In Aly (1969 reprint), 317–28.

on the artistic continuity between Herodotus' source material and his own methods.

With some obvious exceptions (notably Arnaldo Momigliano in his various papers), more recent writers on classical historiography have been less than sympathetic to oral tradition. Moses Finley takes a truly Thucydidean stance, both in the generalities of his *Early Greece* (1970; 2nd edn. 1981) and in his paper on 'Myth, Memory and History', where he states:

> Wherever tradition can be studied among living people, the evidence is not only that it does not exist apart from a connection with a practice or a belief, but also that other kinds of memory, irrelevant memories, so to speak, are short-lived, going back to the third generation, to the grandfather's generation, and, with the rarest of exceptions, no further. That is true even of genealogies, unless they are recorded in writing.[9]

At this point Finley cites the problems Homeric heroes have in remembering beyond their grandfathers; it might be more relevant to cite real, not literary, examples such as Hecataeus' sixteen generations to a god, or Heropythus of Chios' fourteen ancestors,[10] both of whom take us back into the tenth century.

Vansina's conclusions are rather different: talking of work since 1961, he says: 'The last decade has shown that oral traditions have been empirically very fruitful for all history since 1750 or 1800 . . . Trustworthy traditions earlier than 1750 are uncommon and almost entirely limited to states, at least in Africa.'[11] Thus the experience of anthropologists suggests a limit to oral tradition twice as long as Finley's. Undoubtedly too the emergent poleis of early Greece qualify as 'states' in Vansina's sense, and their traditions might therefore extend even further; but in fact it is clear that his suggested time-span of 150–200 years is well supported by the example of Herodotus. Herodotus' information reaches back in reasonable form from 450 BC to the mid seventh century, the colonization of Cyrene, the Cimmerian invasions, and the Corinthian tyranny. The period before 650 BC is virtually unknown, a realm of conjecture and isolated stories which do not in fact correspond well to the realities of the late Dark Age. The worlds of Homer and Hesiod, and (more surprisingly) the first age of western colonization are as shadowy to

[9] 'Myth, Memory and History', in *The Use and Abuse of History* (London, 1975), 11–33 at 27.

[10] For Hecataeus see below, p. 22; for Heropythus, H. T. Wade-Gery, *The Poet of the* Iliad (Cambridge, 1952), 8–9.

[11] Vansina (1973 edn.), xiv.

Herodotus as they were to Thucydides, who had no conception of the existence of a Dark Age, and failed even to distinguish clearly the migrations of that period from the western colonization. The time-span of up to two centuries emerges from both modern and ancient evidence as an empirical fact, in sharp contrast to the theories both of those who attribute to oral cultures exceptional powers of recall and of those who imagine that primitive memories are as short as modern American ones. If we wish to seek a special explanation of this phenomenon in the Greek world apart from its general consonance with evidence from elsewhere, we should not invoke the introduction of the art of writing. This after all occurred about a hundred years before the date in question, and shows its influence on historiography only in the generation after Herodotus, with the use of local archives and dating systems. Herodotus is effectively unaware of such systems and of their usefulness for writing more general history, as demonstrated, for instance, in Thucydides' account of the colonization of Sicily.[12] The oral tradition of *logoi*, to which Herodotus claims to belong, does not present the types of information which writing could have helped to preserve. It is more plausible perhaps to suggest that the information span revealed by Herodotus reflects the development of the polis as an institution in the period from 750 BC to 650 BC; but that would require a whole other investigation. In classical scholarship this dividing-line is already referred to in the idea of a transition from *spatium mythicum* to *spatium historicum*; but these are concepts which possess more resonance than explanatory power.[13]

The fact that the Greek oral traditions on which Herodotus drew seem to operate within the same chronological limits as the traditions of other societies may already require some explanation in relation to the existence of a strong oral epic tradition in early Greece, which is certainly earlier in its origins than the late Dark Age. It might be thought that this should create special conditions which would make early Greece a special case. This question is I think linked to another general characteristic of the traditions recorded in Herodotus which also needs to be discussed: that is, that in many important respects Herodotus' information about the earlier part

[12] Below, p. 23.

[13] See W. M. von Leyden, 'Spatium Historicum', *Durham University Journal*, 11 (1949–50), 89–104; partially reprinted in German translation in W. Marg (ed.), *Herodot* (Darmstadt, 1965), 169–81.

of his period is only quantitatively, not qualitatively, different from his information about the later part. It might be assumed that, as he approached his own day, his information would naturally get better; but though it gets more detailed, it is not really true to say that it gets better. Thus Herodotus had spent much of his youth on Samos only some sixty years after the death of Polycrates, and must have spoken to many who had known him; yet his account of the career of Polycrates is not intrinsically more or less historical than the story of Cypselus and Periander, at the limit of his knowledge.[14] And many of the characteristics of earlier parts of his history recur in his narrative of, for instance, the Ionian revolt and even the Persian wars themselves.[15]

It is usually claimed that the basic explanation for the comparative homogeneity of Herodotus' narrative lies in his literary personality;[16] this is partly true, though I shall argue later that his literary personality in turn is a product of the Greek oral tradition. But it is important to realize that such homogeneity is in itself a characteristic of oral traditions. As Vansina somewhat schematically presents it, oral tradition consists of a 'chain of testimonies', whose reliability is primarily affected, not by the length of the chain, but by the mode of transmission: 'with regard to reliability, there is no doubt that the method of transmission is of far greater importance than the length of time a tradition has lasted' (p. 53). And the same mode of transmission affects the character of a story in the same way, whether it has been preserved for fifty or one hundred and fifty years.

It is this emphasis on the method of transmission in Vansina and elsewhere which seems to me most interesting in its consequences for the study of early Greek history and of Herodotus. The phrase of course refers to two separate but related areas: first the literary and linguistic forms in which traditions may be preserved, and second the social setting in which that preservation takes place.

One theoretical distinction employed by Vansina (and presupposed by Ruth Finnegan in her discussion) concerns us only be-

[14] This problem is not considered in B. M. Mitchell, 'Herodotus and Samos', *JHS* 95 (1975), 75–91. For an analysis of Herodotus' Samian information as three separate *logoi* see H. R. Immerwahr, 'The Samian Stories of Herodotus', *CJ* 52 (1957), 312–22.

[15] For the Ionian revolt see O. Murray, 'The Ionian Revolt', *CAH* IV² (1988), 461–90.

[16] This is the assumption behind most of the works cited in n. 4.

cause it clarifies certain absences in early Greece. It is obvious that the characteristics of verbally fixed traditions will be different from free traditions, where the exact wording varies from telling to telling; in the category of fixed texts Vansina includes poetry, other metrical texts, religious, legal, and other formulae, lists, genealogies, and so on. The Greeks possessed a form of linguistically fixed tradition in the heroic epic (though a tradition that was as much creative as repetitive); but this tradition was non-historical in the sense that for the early Greeks it was not located in time. The Homeric cycle concentrated on one generation with only oblique reference to its immediate forerunners and successors, and did not apparently locate them in a larger historical framework—in marked contrast, for instance, to Jewish tradition or most northern European heroic epic. The creators and preservers of this poetry seem indeed to have been unaware of their own chronological relationship with the age of heroes, except as a world earlier and wholly separated from their own 'age of iron'; it was not until the time of Hecataeus that such links began to be forged. There was no true historical epic in Greece, and no praise poetry concerned with the contemporary world or the immediate past of the type so common in Africa; the society which invented the *epinikion* for athletes had nothing similar for political figures before the fourth century.[17] And, in contrast to the Romans, for instance, other formulaically fixed traditions in religious ritual or law were non-existent or unimportant. The loss of Hecataeus' *Genealogies* makes it difficult for us to judge how many people could equal his own tour de force, or how far any class in Greece shared the genealogical interests of cultures such as Israel and Rome.[18] But there is little sign that Herodotus could draw on such information except in the special instance of kings (Sparta, 7. 204, 8. 131; Macedon, 8. 139, and the eastern monarchies).[19] This comparative absence of genealogies is one of the characteristics of Greek tradition which is obviously re-

[17] [The first part of this statement still seems true; but the discovery of new fragments of Simonides' poem on Plataea suggests that some form of 'praise poetry' did evolve in 5th-cent. Greece, at least in relation to the Persian wars. See the contribution of Ewen Bowie in this volume, and my discussion below, pp. 321–2.]

[18] The widespread use by the Greeks of generation counting in order to measure time does not of course imply the existence of a genealogical interest.

[19] On the eastern monarchies see below, p. 40. The second Spartan king list is of course a partial exception—how partial depends on whether one follows the manuscript text of Herodotus or emends it to reconcile it with Paus. 3. 7. 2.

levant to the question of aristocratic traditions. Of other lists, the few that survived in city archives (such as the Athenian archon list) and temple shrines (the Olympic victor list, the priestesses of Hera at Argos, or the shrine of Apollo Archagetas at Sicilian Naxos, from which I believe Thucydides' Sicilian foundation dates ultimately derive) all postdate the introduction of writing, and were anyway not widely disseminated until the generation after Herodotus.[20]

Herodotus' oral tradition belongs firmly in the category of free not fixed texts: except for oracles and a very few references to poetry, it shows no sign of being constructed around memorized or fixed verbal formulae. There are a few possible examples of aetiological stories attached to proverbs (for instance, most explicitly 'Hippoclides doesn't care', 6. 127–9); and the use of proverbial sayings as part of the narrative technique of Herodotus is rightly emphasized by Mabel Lang.[21] But in general the traditions used by Herodotus do not seem to have included those based on the proverb or collection of sayings, although these are known to have existed.[22] Here we might contrast, for instance, the oral traditions behind the Gospels.[23] The attention of Herodotus was perhaps focused away from such popular story types towards what he regarded as more authoritative traditions.

Both Vansina and Ruth Finnegan argued that it is useful to subdivide this category of free (i.e. essentially prose) texts only in so far as the society itself does so: to attempt to impose such distinctions as those between true and false stories, or between myth, legend, and historical narratives, is misleading, whether we want to investigate the reliability of oral traditions or their literary character. *Our* perception of the type of tradition can only impede understanding of the forces moulding it, which are the type to which it is held to belong by the society concerned, and the social purpose which its preservation and performance fulfil. Thus Vansina discusses all

[20] See D.H. *Thuc.* 5; I shall argue for the Naxian source of Thucydides' Sicilian dates in a forthcoming article 'Thucydides and Local History'.

[21] *Herodotean Narrative and Discourse* [n. 4], 58–67.

[22] The most striking as preserving directly historical information is the proverb 'the cavalry are away': *Suda* s.v. χωρὶς ἱππεῖς, χ 444 Adler. The aphoristic tradition is of course well represented in Presocratic philosophy, and the existence of collections of aphorisms can be traced back as far as the legend of the Seven Wise Men. On oracle-based traditions see below, pp. 31–2.

[23] See especially the work of the form critics, notably H. Dibelius and R. Bultmann: a brief exposition in English is in R. Bultmann and K. Kundsin, *Form Criticism* (Oxford, 1934), 39–63.

prose narratives under the general non-committal heading of 'tales', and treats them as basically subject to the same tendencies, while Ruth Finnegan points out that unless we know the context and spirit in which a story is told, we cannot know whether it functions in that society in ways analogous to our categories of myth, history, or legend. Many societies have no obvious distinction between various types of tale; others distinguish in some way between 'heavy' material (perhaps religious myth and quasi-historical accounts) and 'light' (narrative for entertainment). There are more complex distinctions, as that of the Dogon, between 'true', 'impossible true', and 'impossible false': the same story can be regarded as falling under different categories according to the occasion on which it is told. The Kimbundu classify stories as roughly fictions, didactic, and historical narratives: the last are state secrets transmitted through headmen and elders.[24] Clearly accounts which are considered particularly important to a society or a group within that society, regardless of whether they are true, are more likely to be preserved accurately. In other words the objective truth or falsehood of a tradition is of no importance in judging the accuracy of its transmission, compared with the particular category to which the story is believed to belong and such factors as the relationship between artistic principles, accuracy of preservation, the seriousness with which it is regarded, and the mode and purpose of its preservation.

What type of categories did the Greeks possess? Despite the learned discussion that has centred on the question of the move 'vom Mythos zum Logos' and the attempts made to distinguish these two concepts in early Greek thought,[25] it seems to me that the scepticism engendered by these comparative examples is still in place. Herodotus himself makes no explicit contrast between *logos*, *historiē*, and *mythos*; though the words clearly have different connotations for him, he was not aware of our problems. His own interest is centred on the activity of recording *logoi*, for the results of which the (new?) word *historiē*, implying a degree of system, is also appropriate. He uses the word *logos* to refer to the whole (1. 5,

[24] R. Finnegan, *Oral Literature in Africa* (Oxford, 1970), 363–4.

[25] From W. Nestle's book of this title (1940) to the modern discussion of the consequences of literacy in early Greece. Excellent remarks in F. Hampl, '"Mythos"—"Sage"—"Märchen"', in id., *Geschichte als kritische Wissenschaft*, ii. (Darmstadt, 1975), 1–50.

95, etc.) or larger or smaller parts of his work (2. 38; 5. 36), and to individual stories within it. It is hard to resist the conclusion that he would have described himself as a *logopoios*, like Hecataeus (2. 143; 5. 36, 125) and Aesop (2. 134). From these two examples it seems likely that the connotations of *logos* can cover both fiction and factual narrative. Nor is it easy to see any very clear distinction between Herodotus' use of *logos* and his use of other concepts. *Mythos* is used only twice, and in both cases designates *logoi* which Herodotus believes to be ridiculous as well as false (2. 23, 45); but this is a category which he usually seems to have ignored. It seems that the oral traditions which Herodotus reflects did not in fact make any rigid distinction between different accounts, whether of the gods, or historical events, or the world around them. This does not of course imply that Herodotus and his informants had no interest in the historical truth or falsehood of these accounts. Herodotus' own claims, the preface of Hecataeus' work, and the condemnation of Thucydides 1. 21 all make it clear that accuracy in representing the tradition and the question of its truth were both considered to be important characteristics relevant to the new activity of describing the past. But Herodotus' own selection of *logoi* can perhaps best be understood in relation to a distinction between serious and authoritative *logoi* and frivolous ones, rather than between true and false. Herodotus aims in the first instance to record what he believes to be important or interesting among the *logoi* of various societies, rather than *logoi* which he thinks to be true or which concern particular categories of event.

Perhaps the most obvious and fundamental characteristic of oral tradition is the importance of the group which preserves it. The old romantic belief in the accuracy or at least the symbolic significance of folk memory has been replaced by the realization that 'accurate transmission is more likely if a tradition is not public property but forms the esoteric knowledge of a special group' (Vansina, 31). Group memory is more accurate because it is more continuous and more cohesive than the general recollections of the past. Of course, in this context the question of accuracy must be distinguished from the question of truth. We are here only entitled to assert that the group memory ensures accuracy of transmission: it does not ensure truth, for a fiction or false story is just as capable of being transmitted accurately or inaccurately as a true story.

In contrast to many other societies, ancient and modern, the

Greeks do not seem to have possessed a class of professional remembrancers: once again their interest in the past was scarcely more than average. The occasional evidence of professional keepers of records, like the Pythioi at Sparta, the Kerykes perhaps at Athens, or the hereditary Cretan *poinikastai* who presumably had possessed a similar function and privileges before the introduction of 'Phoenician' writing to the city records,[26] serves only to demonstrate how limited and random such potential sources of tradition must have been. Jacoby's refutation of Wilamowitz's account of the origins of Greek and Attic historiography must stand, and the *exegētai* will never regain their former prominence.[27]

Herodotus recognises the presence of such a professional tradition when he meets it; and he also recognizes in the same context the difference just mentioned between accuracy of transmission and truth. The Egyptians 'who live in the cultivated parts practise *mnēmē* and are by far the *logiōtatoi* that I have put to the test' (2. 77). But such a tradition has limitations: for he is anxious to distinguish that part of his account which is corroborated by Greek informants or depends on his own observation from that part for which he has relied on the Egyptian priests alone (2. 99, 142); and the consequence of the arrival of Greeks in Egypt is that from this point 'we know all subsequent events accurately [*atrekeōs*]' (2. 154). The exact significance of this last assertion is not clear, but it refers to the fact that for the Saite period Herodotus could claim the *agreement* of Egyptian and Greek traditions, as well as his own *opsis* (2. 147).

This limitation to Herodotus' respect for *logioi andres* should not obscure the fact that in general his work is explicitly founded on the testimony of such men. And though they do not normally constitute a professional class, one of whose chief duties is the preservation of tradition, the narrative of Herodotus shows that in each case they are chosen by him because they seem likely to possess an authoritative version of the past.

It is characteristic of Herodotus, and fortunate for us, that he at least appears to represent each tradition separately: he does not seem to seek systematically to contaminate or to rationalize his sources. Instead, he gives one account from each place: when vari-

[26] L. H. Jeffery and A. Morpurgo-Davies, '*Ποινικαστάς* and *ποινικάζειν*: BM 1969 4–2, 1, a New Archaic Inscription from Crete', *Kadmos*, 9 (1970), 118–54; compare the remarks of Evans, *Herodotus* [n. 4], 149–50, on *mnamones* and *hiaromnamones*.

[27] *Atthis* (Oxford, 1949).

ants occur, they are normally derived from different localities. In this he approaches the ideal of the modern observer, who is expected to record each tradition separately. In principle we must assume that Herodotus wishes us to believe that each account is drawn from those whom he regards as *logioi andres*. The model is impeccable, however faulty the execution.[28]

The group memory is not only longer-lasting than folk tradition; it is also likely to be more limited and more liable to bias, for it reflects the interests of the group rather than those of the society as a whole. It often seems to be thought that this question in Herodotus and for early Greek tradition in general can be answered fairly simply by describing Greek oral tradition as generically 'aristocratic'. Thus, for instance, Moses Finley asserts:

> In my judgement for the post-heroic period well into the fifth century, the survival of the sort of tradition I have been discussing must be credited largely to the noble families in the various communities, including royal families where they existed, and, what amounts to the same thing in a special variation, to the priests of such shrines as Delphi, Eleusis, and Delos.[29]

And other scholars are fond of asserting in detail that the weaknesses of Herodotus' account of particular episodes, e.g. Polycrates or Cleomenes, or Solon, are due to his reliance on an often undifferentiated 'aristocratic tradition'. It seems to me on the contrary that the analysis of the structure of Herodotus' *logoi* suggests strongly that, so far from his sources being as homogeneous as this account supposes, for different cities and different areas they have markedly different characteristics and interests. And more specifically it seems to me that the importance of an aristocratic tradition for the narrative of Herodotus has been much exaggerated: with the somewhat surprising exception of Athenian history, there are very few of the typical signs of an aristocratic or family tradition in Herodotus.

As Vansina says, 'every testimony and every tradition has a purpose and fulfils a function. It is because of this that they exist at all. For if a testimony had no purpose, and did not fulfil any function,

[28] To postulate deliberate and wholesale deception (with Fehling, *Herodotus and his 'Sources'* [n. 1]), rather than faulty execution, requires an answer to the question, 'Who invented the model which Herodotus is thought to have abused?' It implies a proto-Herodotus before Herodotus.

[29] 'Myth, Memory and History' [n. 9], 27.

it would be meaningless for anyone to pass it on, and no-one would pass it on' (77). It is the investigation of the purpose of the *logoi* in Herodotus which reveals the milieu or group within which each of them was preserved and repeated, and the purpose reveals itself in the process of selection and reorganization which the *logos* has undergone. In this discussion I would prefer to avoid using words which suggest deliberate intent to mislead or deceive; this may of course be present; but often the factors which have caused a particular tradition to take on a particular shape are not reasons of self-interest or conscious political distortions, but aesthetic or moral considerations. Words like bias, *Tendenz*, or prejudice have the wrong connotations; we need a more neutral word, covering both conscious and unconscious self-interested distortion and literary or aesthetic distortion, as they operate over time within a tradition. The world I would offer is 'deformation'.

Conscious political deformation of course exists. One of the best non-aristocratic examples is the tradition of the Greeks in Egypt. A balanced account of their presence would have drawn on two sources: the merchants at Naucratis, and the descendants of the Greek and Carian mercenaries; the continued presence of the latter is known from Herodotus himself (2. 61: Carians at the festival of Isis slashing their faces with knives, thus proving that they are foreigners and not Egyptians), from hellenistic evidence, and from archaeological finds of the Persian period.[30] But there is no sign that Herodotus met a mercenary, though he visited their deserted *stratopeda*: his information about their activities and their way of life is general and imprecise. His Greek sources for Egyptian history lay in Naucratis, and surely within a particular group in that town. Modern writers have commented on the peculiar nature of his account of Naucratis and the way it ignores the early history of the town. One passage seems to reveal why: Herodotus describes the largest temple, the Hellenion, and lists the nine city groups who control it. He continues, 'the shrine belongs to these people, and these cities are the ones who appoint the *prostatai tou emporiou*: and any other cities that lay a claim to do so claim falsely' (2. 178). The city groups thus excluded consist of the three largest and oldest trading communities in Naucratis, those of Aegina, Samos, and

[30] Simon Hornblower pointed out to me the significance of the Herodotus passage; other evidence in M. M. Austin, *Greece and Egypt in the Archaic Age* (*PCPhS* suppl. 2; Cambridge, 1970), 18–19; T. F. R. G. Braun, *CAH* iii/3 (Cambridge, 1982), 43–8.

Miletus, whose independent sanctuaries are shown by archaeological evidence to be earlier than the Hellenion and to antedate the reign of Amasis. The history of Naucratis as told by Herodotus has been shaped by the claim of one political group, that centred on the Hellenion, to control the city magistracy: it is not surprising that such a tradition records nothing before the reign of Amasis, when this group seems first to have achieved separate status in the town.[31]

This is a tradition of a merchant class with political pretensions; it is scarcely aristocratic in any normal sense, if what is meant by aristocratic tradition is the persistence within particular important families of a set of traditions concerning members of the family. We might (as Vansina and others do) prefer to call them family traditions; but with the proviso that any such tradition which survives to impose itself on a wider public is likely to come from an important family. Such aristocratic or family traditions have particular characteristics. They concern primarily one family and its exploits; their purpose is through the justification and repetition of these exploits to enhance the present standing of the group. Their deformation tends therefore towards political apologia and exaggeration through biography; and they are essentially rationalistic, for they lack any religious or moral purpose. Unlike Finley, I think with most anthropologists that it is in fact useful to distinguish such aristocratic family traditions from a type of tradition in many ways similar, royal family traditions. For royal traditions concern the status not just of a particular family, but of an institution and often of the people as a whole. The Macedonian royal tradition of the activities of Alexander during the Persian wars, and his claim not just to be philhellene but hellene in every respect, are perhaps so clearly represented in Herodotus because they concern not one family, but the Macedonian people as a whole.

The fact that the evidence for the existence of family tradition in Herodotus seems to be strongest in the case of democratic Athens may lead us to speculate on the special status of the Athenian aristocracy. The Alcmaeonid tradition in Herodotus is the obvious example, because we know of a number of episodes in which this version of events differed rightly or wrongly from that which seems to have been more generally current in Athens.[32] Another example

[31] See my *Early Greece* [p. 16 pref. note], 215–17 [=2nd edn. (1993), 228–31].

[32] [See now Rosalind Thomas, *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens* (Cambridge, 1989), ch. 5; but I remain unconvinced by her arguments that

is perhaps the influence of Philaid tradition on the account of the career of Miltiades. And the importance of family tradition in Athens can be used to explain certain gaps in Herodotus' Athenian history. Thus the weakness of his account of the Pisistratid tyranny, in contrast to that found in Thucydides, the Aristotelian *Constitution of the Athenians*, and Plutarch, is no doubt partly due to the disappearance of a Pisistratid family tradition, and to the deliberate silence of their allies the Alcmaeonids on this aspect of the past. Similarly the flight of Themistocles and the disappearance from Athens of any family tradition related to him are perhaps responsible for the peculiar character of the tradition about him, from which he emerges as a culture hero of a particular type,[33] associated with many different popular rather than aristocratic traditions, the Trickster, well represented in most cultures and exemplified in Greek heroic myth by Odysseus.[34]

If the importance of aristocratic tradition in Athens is clear, elsewhere it is less obvious. Spartan tradition, even in so far as it relates to the kings, seems to be unconnected with families, but rather to give an official polis view of the past which it would be easier to attribute to a group aware of the need for social cohesion. The presentation of the tradition about the Corinthian tyranny in Herodotus is so oblique that it would be difficult to draw any conclusions about its direct or ultimate sources; for though the story of Cypselus is a genuine orientalizing myth of the exposure of the hero, of the type analysed in G. Binder's *Die Aussetzung des Königskindes*,[35] it is very probable that Delphi is responsible for the main lines of this tradition. But at least again here there is no sign of family tradition being important.

Thus alongside family tradition, the Greek mainland seems to offer a type of political tradition which lacks any family orientation, but sees the past as a succession of demonstrations of the rightness of present cultural values, in which the individual is subordinate to the ethos of the polis; these traditions belong to a society where

an 'Alcmaeonid tradition' is not dominant in Herodotus' description of a number of key episodes in Athenian history.]

[33] A different type of tradition was available to Plutarch in his *Life of Themistocles*, drawing on local historians in Magnesia: D. Asheri, *Fra Ellenismo e Iranismo* (Bologna, 1983), 52–3.

[34] E. E. Evans-Pritchard, *The Zande Trickster* (Oxford, 1967); M. Detienne and J.-P. Vernant, *Les Ruses de l'intelligence* (Paris, 1974; English trans. 1978).

[35] Below, p. 38.

the hoplite class is dominant. Though this type of memory is in some respects the antithesis of family tradition, both share the characteristics of being fundamentally rationalist and political in their orientation, and showing comparatively little interest in the moral patterns of history or the relation between history and the religious world order.

It seems that many of the traditions of mainland Greece were preserved in a political milieu by certain families or classes. This type of tradition can be regarded as the origin of our western style of history, with its rationalism, its emphasis on action in politics and war, and its obsession with decision-making and human causation. But one of our problems with Herodotus as 'father of history' is that, though he uses such traditions, they do not seem to explain his conception of history: they provide only material, they are not central to the way he approaches his task. That is why we so often find ourselves dissatisfied with him, because we misunderstand his aims. The mainland political tradition is in fact more relevant to Thucydides than to Herodotus.

There is another group of mainland traditions, which appears closely related to the shrine of Delphi. These traditions can initially be recognized by their use of (and often dependence on) oracles, by their purpose in explaining monuments at Delphi, or their emphasis on Delphic intervention. The priests of Delphi were of course capable of 'political' deformation in so far as their shrine was involved in political affairs: only those oracles which turned out to be true may be permitted to be remembered, together with the explanations which validate them: we may expect some (but not too much) invention of oracles;[36] in particular, the priests had to explain the ambivalent attitude of the shrine towards Persia throughout the Persian wars, and the fact that Delphi was the only temple complex not burnt by the Persians—for Apollo 'has spoken all truth for the Persians':[37] naturally it was Apollo who intervened to drive the Persian invaders away from Delphi.

But beyond this the Delphic tradition is not so much political as moralizing and professional. Stories have heroes, figures of impor-

[36] J. Fontenrose, *The Delphic Oracle* (Berkeley, 1978), takes a sceptical view of all oracles which serve as a basis for moralizing historical narratives; but that is often to invert the relationship between fixed text (oracle) and flexible reality: it is the event which is 'quasi-historical', not the oracle.

[37] R. Meiggs and D. M. Lewis, *Greek Historical Inscriptions* (Oxford, 1969), no. 12.

tance in the benefactions to the sanctuary like the kings of Lydia; they contain strong elements of folk-tale motifs, i.e. motifs suitable for use in different stories which (like the formulae of the Homeric bard) provide transitions between episodes, and which point to the skills of a group of professional or semi-professional storytellers. But more importantly, the Delphic tradition seeks to impart a moral dimension to the past. Events are presented in a framework in which the hero moves from prosperity to over-confidence, and finally to a divinely sanctioned reversal of fortune. There is normally no question of sin and retribution involved, unlike some views of the nature of contemporary Attic tragedy; if a crime or an act of *hybris* is committed in the course of the rise to fortune, it is not usually emphasized as the reason for the fall. That rests in the nature of human affairs; cities and empires will rise and fall according to the whims of the gods: in the words of Artabanus, 'You see how the god strikes with his thunderbolt the tall, and will not allow them to display themselves, while small beings do not vex him; you see how the lightning throws down always the greatest buildings and the finest trees' (7. 10). Prosperity causes the envy of the gods, regardless of the hero's moral status. Such an ethic is religious or moral, not aristocratic, and fits well with the priests of a shrine which proclaimed 'know yourself' and 'nothing too much'. It relates of course in certain respects to the hoplite political ethic revealed by traditions elsewhere (e.g. at Sparta), notably in its emphasis on the dangers of excellence; but in origin and in effect it is quite different.

The important fact about this moral and aesthetic patterning is that it does not seem to be confined to accounts derived from Delphi: the whole historical tradition of East Greece as recorded in Herodotus shows similar characteristics. It seems as if there was no political tradition of the mainland type in Ionia: there are no signs of political deformation in the interests of particular groups. Instead even recent history shows heavy use of folk-tale motifs, recurrent patterns, and deformation for moral ends. It is perhaps for this reason that the account of Polycrates is so unhistorical and has such similarities with the stories of the Cypselid age, despite its relative closeness to the lifetime of Herodotus. Similarly, we may contrast the biography of Histiaeus in the Ionian revolt (the only Greek example of a biography in Herodotus)[38] with the way

[38] See my *CAH* chapter 'The Ionian Revolt' [n. 15]. This *logos* has been strangely

that the great contemporary figures of the mainland, Clisthenes, Cleomenes, or Themistocles, are only dimly and fragmentarily perceived.

If I am right in detecting such a fundamental difference between East Greek and mainland traditions, we are led to speculate on the causes of this difference. It might be possible to claim that the Ionian cities were socially different, more homogeneous in respect of wealth, for instance. I doubt whether one factor often invoked is relevant, the alleged eastern influence on Ionian literary traditions; for such influences would certainly not seem confined to Ionia, and in fact appeared earlier and rather more strongly on the mainland, as can be seen, for instance, in the Cypselus legend or in the case of Hesiod; moreover, the notion of eastern influences obscures the very real differences apparent in the styles and themes of the various eastern traditions. Further (to anticipate), there are important differences between Herodotus' eastern stories and the Greek moralizing tradition which concerns us here. I would, however, suggest that the absence of political traditions might well be related to the destruction of political élites in the Persian period and the Ionian revolt.

But that is a negative point: on the positive side I suspect that Aly was right to claim, alongside the Homeric tradition, the existence of a tradition of prose storytelling in Ionia, absent from mainland Greece except Delphi.[39] For the moralizing concerns of so many Ionian *logoi* seem to be related to Herodotus' own conception of history and to his narrative techniques. The general pattern of his work indeed mirrors the pattern visible in many of the Delphic and East Greek traditions; it also uses many of the techniques of the professional storytellers. It is a moral story of Persian pride, symbolized in the arrogance of Xerxes and humbled by the Greeks: the gods punish those who pass beyond the limits of human propriety. The main story of the Persian wars abounds in devices like dreams, portents, forewarnings. Xerxes is deliberately drawn into the conflict by false dreams; the figure of the wise adviser disregarded (Demaratus, Artabanus) is central to the creation of suspense and

neglected in the discussion on the origins of Greek biography from H. Homeyer, 'Zu den Anfängen der griechischen Biographie', *Philologus*, 106 (1962), 75–85, onwards.

[39] See esp. Aly, *Volksmärchen* [p. 18], 208 ff.

foreboding in such a type of storytelling where the pattern is already known.[40]

This overall pattern to the story of the Persian wars is Herodotus' own creation. It does not derive from attitudes in mainland Greece to the meaning of the past; we can sometimes detect the tensions as the protagonists of the war, Corinth, Sparta, Athens, see it in narrower polis and political terms of city honour. This pattern did not, therefore, come to Herodotus from his material. But to one brought up in the traditions of storytelling in Ionia it was the obvious way to present the Great Event. It is in fact this moralizing East Greek tradition which created Herodotus as a historian, and which moulded his attitudes towards the patterns in history, the narrative techniques of his art, and the roles of creativity, accuracy, and invention. For we must recognize that ultimately truth in Herodotus is a question of aesthetics and morality, as much as of fact.

We may, if we wish, go further, and suggest that behind the preservation of the past in Ionia, and therefore behind the invention of history, there lies a moralizing tradition of storytelling such as we find in Delphi. Just as the Homeric epic is the creation of an oral tradition of professional Homeric bards revealed and transcended by the greatest of them all, and thereby preserved in writing only in its final stage (genius and the need to preserve it together destroying the oral tradition), so Herodotus too perhaps is the heir to a tradition of oral *logopoioi*, storytellers, who transcended his forerunners by moulding into a unity the traditional tales of his art, and ensured its disappearance by collecting and writing them down in relation to a new and greater theme—the last and greatest of the *logopoioi* by virtue of being a *logographos*. The parallel with Homer is merely a restatement of Herodotus' own perceptions; for Herodotus was well aware that in his *Histories* he was following the example of Homer, in recording a Great War and singing of a new generation of heroes.[41] Truth is subordinate to this aim of history.

[40] H. Bischoff, *Der Warner bei Herodot* (diss. Marburg, 1932), partially reprinted in Marg (ed.) *Herodot* [n. 13], 302–19.

[41] On Homer and Herodotus see esp. E. Norden, *Antike Kuntsprosa*, 2nd edn. (Leipzig, 1909), 40; Jacoby, 'Herodotos', *RE* suppl ii (1913), 205–520 at 502–4; Aly, *Volksmärchen* [p. 18], 263–77; L. Huber, 'Herodots Homerverständnis', in *Synusia: Festgabe W. Schadewaldt* (Pfullingen, 1965), 29–52.

II

Twenty years ago Arnaldo Momigliano considered the impact of the Persian empire on Jewish and Greek historical writing in a famous paper which also offers the best starting-point for a discussion of the sources available to Herodotus for his account of Persian history.[42] Within the general framework of a heightened national self-consciousness among both Jews and Greeks as a result of their contacts with the Persian empire, he noted three main areas of possible eastern influence on Greek historiography: there were obvious signs of 'elements of Eastern and particularly Persian storytelling'; oriental or Graeco-oriental biographical tales (like those of Zopyrus and Democedes) might have affected the development of a Greek tradition of writing biographical accounts of politicians; finally, although Jewish historians were clearly influenced by Persian governmental practice in their use of documents, the possible extent and limitations of Greek use of such documents were still obscure. How far has the picture changed in the meantime, and in what directions is further research likely to prove fruitful?

The earlier analysis of Greek traditions will have made some points clear. First, the investigation should not start from the historical reliability of the traditions available to Herodotus, let alone from the truth or falsehood of single statements or episodes: these are secondary questions, which can only be considered after the types of tradition have been established. This is of course a fundamental principle of all forms of source criticism, not one peculiar to oral traditions, though it tends to be forgotten more often in the oral context. Second, on the model proposed above, we should think especially in terms of the preservation of tradition and of channels of information: what types of *logioi andres* were available and recognizable to the more or less conscientious Greek enquirer?

I begin with a negative proposition: it is important to remember what was not available to or not used by Herodotus. There is no sign

[42] 'Fattori orientali della storiografia ebraica post-esilica e della storiografia greca' (1965), now in id., *Terzo contributo* (Rome, 1966), 807–18; English translation in *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography* (Oxford, 1977), 25–35. See also Pierre Briant, 'Sources grecques et histoire achéménide', in id., *Rois, tributs et paysans* (Paris, 1982), 491–506, and Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg, 'The Fifth Oriental Monarchy and Hellenocentrism', in Sancisi-Weerdenburg and Kuhrt (eds.), *Achaemenid History* [p. 16 pref. note], ii. 117–31.

that Herodotus had access to a priestly tradition, oral or written. It is not possible to analyse the Persian *logoi* in the way that has become accepted for his account of Egypt;[43] Herodotus' lack of understanding of Persian religion and superficial account of the Magi are enough to demonstrate that he had no direct contact with a Persian priestly class who may well have possessed an oral tradition of some interest.[44] One type of tradition is thus ruled out for Persia as for Mesopotamia.

The question of Mesopotamian traditions raises a wider question about Herodotus' contacts: the most important groups of *logioi andres* in the Near East belonged essentially to a literate culture, some at least of whose main literary forms are known to us through written records. One of the most obvious characteristics of Herodotus' accounts of eastern societies is that they show no sign of any influence from the known literary or historical genres preserved in writing, such as royal inscriptions, priestly chronicles, law codes, or sacred texts: in this he contrasts very strongly with the Jewish historical tradition both before and after the exile. This suggests, not only that Herodotus' historical methods and literary techniques are independent of eastern written traditions, but also that he did not even have extensive access to the guardians of those traditions as oral witnesses; for their modes of thought would surely have been marked by the influence of their status and their skills as a literate caste. Herodotus' accounts of eastern events are not patterned in the same way as his account of Egyptian history, by the influence (however mediated) of a priesthood whose skills as storytellers reflect their activities as guardians of a written tradition.

We must admit one significant exception. There is no doubt that documentary models lie behind three of the most famous Persian passages in Herodotus, the satrapy list (3. 89–97), the description of the Persian royal road (5. 52–3), and the Persian army and navy lists (7. 61–98). That is not, of course, to say that these passages

[43] See most systematically A. B. Lloyd, *Herodotus Book II*, esp. *Introduction* (Leiden, 1975).

[44] See most explicitly the claim of Strabo about the Magi, 15. 3. 18. If such a tradition existed, it could of course have influenced indirectly Herodotus' *logoi*: for this possibility see esp. P. R. Helm, 'Herodotus' *Medikos Logos* and Median History', *Iran*, 19 (1981), 85–90. I am not, however, clear, when Helm talks of 'Iranian popular saga' and 'independent heroic sagas' as a source for Median and Persian history, whether he is seeking to revive the theory of A. Christensen of the existence of fixed texts in the form of heroic poetry, or whether he is merely postulating free prose tales.

rest on documents: the notion of an army list left behind in the Persian camp after the battle of (say) Plataea is even less plausible than the theory that Herodotus lifted this or that entire passage from Hecataeus of Miletus. These are not documents either in our modern sense or even in the contemporary Jewish sense. They are lists created under the influence of documentary models. Literacy, as Jack Goody has demonstrated, encourages certain mental forms, the most common of which, the table and the list, belong especially to bureaucratic practices.[45] In the case of the two main passages of Herodotus, the problems involved in detailed analysis of the information, and the uncertainty about a possible date or function for the alleged underlying 'documents', suggest that we should emphasize the aspects of orality and written model. But however that may be, clearly involved in their transmission or their creation is a documentary mentality which is not usual to Herodotus. It is this phenomenon of documentary orality which attracts me to the hypothesis of David Lewis, that one source for Herodotus' information on Persia was the Greek element in the Persian imperial bureaucracy.[46] Belonging to at least the fringes of a highly specialized literate culture, in their organization of material they would naturally follow the scribal mental forms of the table and the list: asked for information, they would reply, not with a *logos*, but with an ordered 'documentary form'. To consider Momigliano's comparison, this is one step short of the Jewish historian's practice of actually quoting 'documents', since in that case the historian himself takes on elements from the scribal culture, but it can involve much the same potential danger of misleading us by suggesting the existence of an independent document behind what is in fact a form more or less consciously created or manipulated by the historian; yet both traditions rest on an acceptance of scribal practice and the scribal mentality. The attractions of this hypothesis as a way

[45] *The Domestication of the Savage Mind* (Cambridge, 1977), esp. chs. 4 and 5. O. K. Armayor, 'Herodotus' Catalogues of the Persian Empire in the Light of the Monuments and the Greek Literary Tradition', *TAPhA* 108 (1978), 1–9, criticizes the passages as if they were documents, and inevitably finds them unsatisfactory; better Briant, 'Sources grecques et histoire achéménide' [n. 42], 495–500.

[46] See 'Persians in Herodotus', in M. H. Jameson (ed.), *The Greek Historians: Literature and History. Papers presented to A. E. Raubitscheck* (Saratoga, 1985), 101–17, and D. M. Lewis, 'The King's Dinner (Polyaenus IV 3. 32)', in Sancisi-Weerdenburg and Kuhrt (eds.), *Achaemenid History* [p. 16, pref. note], ii. 79–87; also M. A. Dandamayev, 'Herodotus' Information on Persia and the Latest Discoveries of Cuneiform Texts', *Storia della storiografia*, 7 (1985), 92–9.

forward are obvious: it enables us to relate our two main bodies of evidence, the Persian documentary archives, both those surviving at Persepolis and those to be supposed elsewhere, and the Greek literary tradition; and it postulates a type of tradition which is likely to possess a relatively high level of detailed factual accuracy.

This hypothesis serves to highlight a quite different type of patterning in Herodotus' Persian account, which, if it is related to less reliable types of information, is nevertheless more dominant. The main Persian narrative of Herodotus is organized in two great blocks. The first gives a description of the fall of the Median empire and the rise of Cyrus, centred on the figure of Harpagus the Mede (1. 73–4, 95–130). The account uses a number of stories of different origins, most notably the narrative of the birth and upbringing of Cyrus, which is a Mesopotamian foundation legend going back to Sumerian times, adapted to become part of the official Achaemenid dynastic myth.[47] But despite its use of disparate elements, the narrative possesses a unity and a number of recurrent explanatory motifs (such as the eating of human flesh (1. 73, 119),[48] which suggest a single non-Greek reworking of more varied traditions; and, given the Median slant to the story, it is likely enough that its basic form represents a Median aristocratic version of events. The further theory that it came to Herodotus from the family tradition of Harpagus himself is less likely, given the way he is characterized (if only in a speech) at the end of the story, as 'at once the silliest and the most unjust of men: the silliest, if when it was in his power to put the crown on his own head . . . he had placed it on the head of another; the most unjust, if on account of that supper he had brought slavery on the Medes' (1. 129).[49]

[47] We are fortunate in knowing something about both myth and ritual: see A. Alföldi, 'Königsweihe und Männerbund bei den Achämeniden', *Schweizerisches Archiv für Volkskunde*, 47 (1951), 11–16; G. Binder, *Die Aussetzung des Königskindes* (Meisenheim a. G., 1964), with my review, *CR*, NS 17 (1967), 329–32. R. Drews, 'Sargon, Cyrus and Mesopotamian Folk History', *JNES* 33 (1974), 387–93, has some interesting observations on the version of the Cyrus legend derived from Ctesias, which suggest that it is closer to the Sargon story, and therefore perhaps a 'Mesopotamian' version rather than a Persian one.

[48] Not in itself of course unknown to the Greeks, but treated by them rather differently; compare Thyestes. For this theme see W. Burkert, *Homo Necans* (Berlin, 1972), 108–25; M. Detienne, *Dionysos mis à mort* (Paris, 1977), ch. 3. In connection with p. 43, I note that the motif is transferred to Lydia by Xanthus, *FGrHist* 765 F 18.

[49] The Median origin is generally accepted, e.g. J. M. Cook, *Cambridge History of Iran*, ii (Cambridge, 1985), 203–4; the family tradition of Harpagus is an idea

The second great block of Persian narrative describes the episode of the Magian usurpation and the revolution by which Darius came to power, again from a distinctive viewpoint (3. 30, 61–88). The official version of these events was of course at least potentially widely available in the Persian empire, since Darius had ordered it to be circulated and published in the various languages of the empire (though it may be doubtful whether these would have included Greek).[50] But while Herodotus' account corresponds closely with this version, it is not derived from it: it is rather a telling or retelling of the alleged events from the point of view of the small group of Persian conspirators who included Darius not as a leader but merely as one of their number. Here the combination of a close relationship to the official royal version promulgated by Darius with the non-royal viewpoint makes it very likely that we are dealing with an account derived from oral tradition within one of the great families involved; and J. Wells long ago identified the most likely source for this, as for the account of the siege of Babylon (3. 153–60), in the family traditions of Zopyrus, great-grandson of the conspirator, who deserted to Athens in the lifetime of Herodotus.[51]

These generally accepted conclusions establish two blocks of historical narrative, one Median, the other more strictly Persian, which are perhaps as close as we are ever likely to get to what might be called a Persian historiography. It is worth therefore considering their characteristics and limitations.

In both cases the narrative is concerned with high politics and events that shaped world history; in both cases it is closely related to an official royal version of those events. But despite that relationship, in both cases we are offered not the official version itself, but a

that goes back to the 19th cent.: see the references in J. V. Prášek, 'Hekataios als Herodots Quelle zur Geschichte Vorderasiens', *Klio*, 4 (1904), 199–200. But 'there must have been some Greek reworking of the story. The H in Harpagos seems to refer to popular etymology and can only have been attached to the Iranian name Arbaka in Greek surroundings; cf. R. Schmitt, *ZDMG* 117 (1967), 133 n. 103; M. Mayrhofer, *Onomastica Persepolitana* (Vienna, 1973), 154' (letter from H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg).

[50] Behistun inscription col. 4 paras. 60–1 and 70 in R. G. Kent, *Old Persian*, 2nd edn. (New Haven, 1953), 131–2.

[51] J. Wells, 'The Persian Friends of Herodotus', in id., *Studies in Herodotus* (Oxford, 1923), 95–111. I agree with Lewis, 'Postscript 1984', in A. R. Burn, *Persia and the Greeks* (London, 1962, 2nd edn. 1984), 105–6, that Zopyrus is not likely to have been a source both for this (often tendentious and unreliable) narrative *and* for the more 'documentary' elements discussed earlier.

variant of it, related to the interests of a more or less precisely identifiable non-royal ruling group. Thus Herodotus had access, not to an official royal version of Persian history, but to variants of it current in the high aristocracy: paradoxically it was always easier for Greeks to make contact with the ruling classes in the Persian empire than with the imperial bureaucracy. Here, then, were men well qualified to stand among the normal types of Herodotus' *logioi andres*.

The accounts that these groups could offer fall short of being historical in important respects. First, they seem to be episodic, rather than continuous or biographical.[52] We are not offered a coherent narrative or biography of any eastern king; rather Herodotus relates within a regnal framework a series of isolated but detailed stories. Second, the narrative itself and the elements of which it is composed seem to be fundamentally oral in form: it is patterned as a succession of stories independent of each other and often without obvious connections; the resonances and repetitions give the impression of being folk-tale motifs, traditionally accepted devices to explain motivation or actions. This is what we would expect from an aristocratic society which, for all its use of a literate bureaucracy, remained fundamentally illiterate.

Two points may make us hesitate. First, whence the regnal framework, which covers in formulaic phrases both the Median and the Persian royal houses: 'having reigned three and fifty years Deioces was at his death succeeded by his son Phraortes' (1. 102); 'Cyrus himself fell after reigning nine and twenty years' (1. 214)? But since this characteristic formula is also used by Herodotus in relation to Lydian and Egyptian kings, it is scarcely possible to claim it as a sign of the influence of Mesopotamian royal chronicle; it may be borrowed from these other cultures but it is anyway independent of the main Median–Persian narrative, with which it does not entirely fit.[53] Whatever its origin, it should not, I think, mislead us into claiming the existence of a continuous Persian account of each king, either biographical or in chronicle form.

The second question we may ask is whether it is fortuitous that both our blocks of narrative centre on a particular type of episode, the foundation of a dynasty, on origins and accessions. This at least

[52] It is for this reason that I do not discuss the question of biography raised by Momigliano (above, p. 35).

[53] H. Strasburger, 'Herodots Zeitrechnung', in Marg (ed.), *Herodot* [n. 13], 688–736; cf. R. Drews, 'The Fall of Astyages and Herodotus' Chronology', *Historia*, 18 (1969), 1–11.

might seem a genuine Persian trait that has had a continuing impact on world literature from Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* onwards.[54] It looks as if the royal preoccupation with legitimacy and the validation of power had a significant effect in the process of selecting earlier Mesopotamian motifs and moulding the oral traditions of Persia, by providing a narrative framework which came to dominate them. Again this scarcely suggests that there existed any specifically Persian form of royal chronicle: the references that we have to such chronicles surely pertain to non-Persian records kept in one or more of the languages of the imperial bureaucracy, in 'the usual impersonal style of Eastern annalistic writing'.[55]

By comparison with Greek and other oral traditions we can say that these Persian traditions are not as clearly aristocratic as one might expect, given that they were preserved in an aristocratic milieu. The account of Darius' accession, it is true, shows a typical interest in the rights and privileges of a particular group of families (3. 84); but in general the stories are marked by a recourse to the folk-tale motifs and repetitive use of stock situations that is more often thought characteristic of popular traditions. It should not perhaps surprise us if the Persian aristocracy is seen to submerge itself here as elsewhere in the existing cultural forms of the empire; but Karl Reinhardt was surely right to recognize differences between the general traditions of the Greek *logos* and eastern storytelling. These Persian stories lack the moral or religious dimension of their Greek counterparts; in Reinhardt's formulation, the Persian *Novelle* is a pure form, 'a story capable of being told as a unity with beginning and end, without regard to how perfectly or imperfectly it corresponds to an alleged "historical" reality which may lie behind it'.[56]

In terms of content the Persian stories in Herodotus are also composed of typical elements, and deal in stock situations absent or rare in his Greek stories. They are court novels, of palace plots, of cruel punishments and even crueller vengeance, of faithful viziers and treachery, of harem intrigue and bedroom scenes, where women

[54] See Sancisi-Weerdenburg, 'The Fifth Oriental Monarchy and Hellenocentrism' [n. 42] and the references cited there.

[55] Momigliano, *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography* [n. 42], 28.

[56] 'Herodots Persergeschichten', in id., *Vermächtnis der Antike* (Göttingen, 1960), 133–74 at 138. Compare the remarks of S. Trenkner, *The Greek Novella in the Classical Period* (Cambridge, 1958), 24–5, on the moral seriousness of Herodotus' *Novellen* in contrast to those of other writers.

have equal power with men to decide history. This is particularly obvious in the two blocks of narrative under discussion, where we see two great historical events of different nature, the rise of Persia and the usurpation of Darius, retold within the framework of the *Palastgeschichte*; in each case we know that these same events could be and were described differently, even within the Persian tradition—as instances of divine protection of the king and the triumph of righteousness. Instead the account of Cyrus' divinely ordained rise to power is transformed by being subordinated to a story of revenge and the faithless vizier; while the accession of Darius by the favour of Ahuramazda is played out in the bedchamber and the harem.

We should not ignore the importance of this interpretation of Persian history; it may derive many of its elements from popular sources; but, if it represents the considered response of the Persian aristocracy to their world, it can hardly fail to have reinforced the style of court life which it purported to describe. What is of course significant about this tradition is that it is identical with that which must lie behind the narratives of those later Greek historians who may be thought to have had direct knowledge of Persia, notably Ctesias and (to a lesser extent) Xenophon. It could well be argued that the history of Ctesias, with all its unsatisfactory elements, its lack of chronological framework and arbitrary reinterpretation of events 'breathing seraglio and eunuch perfumes, mixed with the foul stench of blood' (Eduard Meyer), is in fact a truly Persian history—not the invention of a Greek doctor, but an account of Persian court life as the Persian aristocracy saw it. The absence of a Persian history is after all a Persian failure, not a Greek one. But I am not yet proposing the rehabilitation of Ctesias as the leading exponent of a lost Persian historiography;[57] I am, however, happy to welcome studies that take seriously as oral tradition the oriental *Novelle* in both its Greek and its Jewish dress: it may not be reducible to our sort of history, but it is a genuine expression of Persian traditions about the past.[58]

[57] Such a rehabilitation is already under way among Iranists and Assyriologists: see F. W. König, *Ktesias* (*Archiv für Orientforschung*, suppl. 18; Graz, 1972); W. Nagel, *Ninos und Semiramis* (Tübingen, 1982). But see Jacoby, 'Ktesias', *RE* xi/2 (1922), 2032–73; A. Momigliano, 'Tradizione e invenzione in Ctesia', in id., *Quarto contributo* (Rome, 1969), 181–212; R. Drews, *The Greek Accounts of Eastern History* (Washington, 1973), 103–16.

[58] H. W. A. Sancisi-Weerdenburg, *Yauna en Persai* (diss. Groningen, 1980).

It does not worry me, as it did not worry Reinhardt, that one of the most striking examples of the type of patterning that we have been interpreting is provided by the story of Gyges, king of Lydia, in its Herodotean version (1. 7–12). The Greek perception of Persia was derivative on the Greek perception of Lydia. It was Lydian culture and the Mermnad dynasty which gave the Greeks their model of an eastern society and of oriental despotism. Equally we know that there existed in Asia Minor of the fifth century a unified Lydian–Persian aristocratic culture, whose traditions must have fused together, allowing attitudes to Persian monarchy to be transferred to the Lydian monarchy. The Gyges story is in any event an exception within the Lydian *logos*: the various stories connected with Croesus are quite different in character and clearly Greek in origin. It was not until Xanthus of Lydia that Lydian history became fully assimilated to the Persian model.[59]

More problematic is the difficulty referred to by Momigliano in his ironical remark, 'even a scholar with as fine an ear as K. Reinhardt was hardly able to distinguish between authentic Persian tales and tales attributed to the Persians by Greeks'.[60] It is of course true that the eastern court novel has sufficient similarities with story types in the Greek tradition for it to be easy for the Greeks to take over and even create court novels in their own style. It has always been hard to refute those who follow the simple way out of refusing to make generic distinctions and claiming that all story types are the same, just as it is hard to refute those who attribute nothing to Herodotus' power of observation and everything to his imagination. In replying to the sceptics we must proceed on various levels. First, we must try to delineate carefully the general characteristics which seem to differentiate stories told in an eastern context from those told in a Greek context in the spirit of Reinhardt. Second, we can point to detailed evidence which implies a basic Persian narrative; we are lucky that it is possible to demonstrate this for both our main Persian stories in Herodotus, in respect of general story line and also in many significant details which lie behind attempts at Greek rationalization; to take one example, the story of Darius' mare (3.

[59] This tendency is abundantly clear from the fragments of Xanthus, *FGrHist* 765; cf. n. 48 above. He also wrote *Magika* on Persia, F 31–2. For bibliography on the Lydian *logos* of Herodotus see C. Talamo, 'Erodoto e il regno di Lidia', *Storia della storiografia*, 7 (1985), 150–61 [and now the forthcoming English edition of D. Asheri's commentary on Herodotus book 1].

[60] *Alien Wisdom* (Cambridge, 1975), 131.

84–7) attests a practice of horse divination non-existent in Greece, but still practised in Persia as late as the Sasanian period.[61]

Finally, we should be willing to admit cross-cultural influences. We have seen the fusion of Lydian and Persian kingship; orientalism[62] is at least as old as the fifth century. By then, as Alföldi saw, the oriental monarch and the Greek tyrant had also fused in popular imagination,[63] and Reinhardt was happy to show how the Persian wars narrative of Herodotus itself combined elements of the Persian court novel with Greek storytelling to construct a plausible Persian version of events, which must surely rest on Herodotus' own historical imagination. But no one should be afraid of imagination in history.

[61] Agathias 4. 25; references to modern discussions in M. A. Dandamayev, *Persien unter den ersten Achämeniden* (Wiesbaden, 1976), 166 n. 714.

[62] E. W. Said, *Orientalism* (Harmondsworth, 1985), 56. This is of course a main theme of Momigliano, *Alien Wisdom* [n. 60], ch. 6.

[63] 'Gewaltherrscher und Theaterkonig', in K. Weitzmann (ed.), *Late Classical and Mediaeval Studies in Honor of A. M. Friend, Jr.* (Princeton, 1955), 15–55.

3

Ancestors of Historiography in Early Greek Elegiac and Iambic Poetry?

EWEN L. BOWIE

In this paper I propose (I) to review briefly the traces of narrative early Greek elegiac and iambic poetry that might be seen as ancestors of historiography; (II) to assess how many of these traces might be securely or conjecturally claimed to be composed for sympotic, and how many for other, locations of performance; and (III) to ask to what extent any features of our earliest prose historiography might be argued to betray the influence of the techniques or performance conditions of such verse narrative. Section IV offers a very brief conclusion.

I

(*a*) One clear set of traces of narrative that deserves to count as historiographic is to be found in some longer elegies ascribed to poets composing between *c.*650 BC and the latter part of the fifth century. In the early 1980s[1] I argued that a number of poets recounted events in both the early and recent history of poleis—Tyrtaeus, Mimnermus, and Semonides of Amorgos in the seventh century; Xenophanes at the end of the sixth; Panyassis early and Ion of Chios later in the fifth. I would first like to revisit the evidence and

[1] 'Early Greek Elegy, Symposium and Public Festival', *JHS* 106 (1986), 13–35, the text of a paper that benefited from discussion by several audiences in the previous quinquennium.

concede modifications in the picture that I then proposed, and then to add testimony for two further cases.

It remains unfortunately true that these are poems of whose features we know very little. In the case of Tyrtaeus' *Eunomia* the title is attested as early as Aristotle:[2] he adduces this poem, without verbatim citation, for the phenomenon of the exacerbation of conflict between rich and poor by war. It must have supported his statement that at the time of the Messenian war some people in distress as a result of the war demanded a redistribution of land. The title *Eunomia* is also used by Strabo when citing four lines whose use of the first person plural (*ἀφικόμεθα*) he takes as evidence that Tyrtaeus was himself a Spartan. These lines offer the fact that Zeus gave 'his city' to the Heraclidae with whom 'we' came to the Peloponnese as a reason for (*γάρ*) what went before in the poem. An Oxyrhynchus papyrus (2824, of the first or second century AD) yielded scraps of the preceding eleven lines (and one word of a following line). These scraps showed that they contained an exhortation to obey (*πειθώμεθα*, 10), perhaps to obey a king or the kings, and that this in turn was related to oracles (*θεοπρο*[*πίας*?] 2, *μαντείας* 4).[3] It is an attractive idea[4] that the fragment known from Diodorus and Plutarch's *Lycurgus*,[5] in which Tyrtaeus narrated how either

[2] Pol. 1306[b]36–40 = Tyrtaeus 1 W: *συνέβη δὲ καὶ τοῦτο ἐν Λακεδαίμονι, ὑπὸ τὸν Μεσσηνιακὸν πόλεμον· δῆλον δὲ {καὶ τοῦτο} ἐκ τῆς Τυρταίου ποιήσεως τῆς καλουμένης Εὐνομίας· θλιβόμενοι γάρ τινες διὰ τὸν πόλεμον ἠξίουν ἀνάδαστον ποιεῖν τὴν χώραν.*

[3] Strabo 8. 4. 10, 362 C, cites 12–15 of Tyrtaeus 2 W = 1[a] GP with the remark *καὶ γὰρ εἶναί φησιν ἐκεῖθεν* [sc. *ἐκ Λακεδαίμονος*] *ἐν τῇ ἐλεγείᾳ ἣν ἐπιγράφουσιν Εὐνομίαν*. The combination of his text and that of P. Oxy. 2824 is as follows:

]. . . ὐο . . [
. . . ϵ θϵοπρο[π
]. . ϕ . . ϵνακ[
]. μαντειαϛαν[
τ̣ειδ̣ε̣̈ταθή̣ . [5
]πάντ' ϵἰδϵν . [
ἄ]νδραϛ ἀνιστ[αμεν
]ι[.]ηγαλα[
]. . [. . .]θ̣ϵοῖσι φί[λ
]ῳ πϵι̣θ̣ώμ̣ε̣θα κ[10
]αν ἐγγύτεροι γέν[ϵος·
αὐτὸς γὰρ Κρονίωνι καλλιστεφάνου ⟨πόσις⟩ Ἥρης
Ζεὺς Ἡρακλείδαις⟨ι⟩ ἄστυ δέδωκϵ τόδϵ,
οἷσιν ἅμα προλιπόντες Ἐρινεὸν ⟨ἠ⟩νεμόϵντα
εὐρεῖαν Πέλοπο⟨ϛ⟩ νῆσον ἀφικόμ⟨ε⟩θα 15
]γλαυκώπ[ι]δοϛ[

[4] Already in M. L. West, *Studies in Elegy and Iambus* (Berlin, 1974), 184–5.

[5] Tyrtaeus 4 W = 1[b] GP, from Diodorus 7. 12. 6, Plut. *Lyc.* 6. 7.

Theopompus and Polydorus or, as they have it, Lycurgus brought oracles from Delphi, also came from the *Eunomia* and is to be located shortly before 2 W.

Narrative is also the mode of 5W, a brief account of how the Spartans fighting under Theopompus for nineteen years defeated the Messenians based in Ithome in the twentieth. However, our fragment begins with a reference in the dative to Theopompus, through whom the victory was won,[6] and the narrative itself is very short. Accordingly, we cannot be sure that its context was one of narrative rather than exhortation; and indeed there is no guarantee that this sequence comes from the *Eunomia* at all. The question of context must also be asked of fr. 2W: what is to be inferred from the first-person plural subjunctive *πειθώμεθα* (line 10)? Although I have sometimes been tempted to suppose that this is part of a speech delivered by a character in a narrative—which would allow the framework to be narrative, not exhortatory—Strabo, whose handling of early poetic texts I increasingly respect, clearly did not think this. I am now much more sceptical than I presented myself in 1986 about the hypothesis that the *Eunomia* was a narrative poem of quite the sort that the evidence does suggest some others to have been. Nor, moreover, do we have any clues about the poem's length beyond the fact that at some date it was given a title. If it was a poem of around 200 lines, longer than Solon's 100-line *Salamis* (which was also given a title)[7] but similarly exhortatory in thrust, it has little to offer those trying to create a genealogy for historiography. We might be dealing with an exhortatory poem which simply had bursts of narrative which were functionally similar to narrative elements in speeches of characters in the *Iliad*.

I see no reason to sing a similar palinode about Mimnermus' *Smyrneis*, or to suppose, as do some scholars, that the *Smyrneis* was only a part of one of the two books in which Mimnermus' poetry circulated.[8] Even if that were so, some hard facts can be clung to:

[6] *ἡμετέρωι βασιλῆϊ, θεοῖσι φίλωι Θεοπόμπωι, | ὃν διὰ Μεσσήνην εἴλομεν εὐρύχορον . . .* (Tyrtaeus 5. 1–2 W = 2 GP).

[7] Solon 1 W = 2 GP, cited as the opening of a 100-line poem entitled *Salamis* by Plut. *Sol*. 8. 1.

[8] C. W. Müller, 'Die antike Buchausgabe des Mimnermos', *RhM* 131 (1988), 197–211; A. W. Allen, *The Fragments of Mimnermus: Text and Commentary* (Palingenesia, 44; Wiesbaden, 1993). For the view that the titles *Nanno* and *Smyrneis* were those of the two attested books see e.g. West, *Studies in Elegy and Iambus* [n. 4], 72–6.

(1) There was a poem entitled *Smyrneis* in which a speech (*μῦθος*) was delivered by a king.[9]

(2) There was a poem about the Smyrnaeans fighting Gyges and the Lydians in the prooemion of which Muses were addressed and a distinction drawn between those which were the daughters of Uranus and those the daughters of Zeus.[10] There is a strong chance that this too was the *Smyrneis*.

Then there are what are not, indeed, hard facts, but range from probabilities to possibilities:

(3) If the interpretation I and some others have offered of Callimachus, *Aetia* 1. 9–12, is correct, the *Smyrneis* was a long poem, perhaps long enough to be seen as similar to the pre-Callimachean hellenistic narrative elegies which Alan Cameron has argued Callimachus is criticizing.[11]

(4) More speculative still, Callimachus' joke about a tall lady may allude to Smyrna's foundation by the Amazon Smyrna, and that may have been one episode in Mimnermus' poem.

(5) Another part of Mimnermus' poem may be constituted by a fragment which recalls the qualities ascribed by *πρότεροι* to a warrior who routed Lydian cavalry in the Hermos plain, and which may contrast these qualities with those displayed by contemporaries.[12] But we have no indication from our source, John of Stobi, that this piece was from the *Smyrneis*.

(6) The six-line narrative of how Smyrnaeans left Pylos, settled

[9] Mimnermus 13a. 2–4 W=21 GP, from the commentary on Antimachus in P. Univ. Mediol. 17 col. ii. 26, i. 51 Vogliano (with pl. 1):

Μίμνερμ[ος] δ[' ἐν] τῆι Σμυρνηΐδι
ὡς οἳ πὰρ βασιλῆος, ἐπε[ί ῥ'] ἐ[ν]εδέξατο μῦθον,
ἧ[ἰξ]αν κοίληι[ς ἀ]σπίσι φραξάμενοι.

[10] Mimnermus 13 W=22 GP=Paus. 9. 29. 4: *Μίμνερμος δὲ ἐλεγεῖα ἐς τὴν μάχην ποιήσας τὴν Σμυρναίων πρὸς Γύγην τε καὶ Λυδούς, φησὶν ἐν τῷ προοιμίῳ θυγατέρας Οὐρανοῦ τὰς ἀρχαιοτέρας Μούσας, τούτων δὲ ἄλλας νεωτέρας εἶναι Διὸς παῖδας.*

[11] A. Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton, 1995), 263 ff.

[12] Mimnermus 14.1–7 W=23 GP=Stob. 3. 7. 11:

οὐ μὲν δὴ κείνου γε μένος καὶ ἀγήνορα θυμὸν
τοῖον ἐμέο προτέρων πεύθομαι, οἵ μιν ἴδον
Λυδῶν ἱππομάχων πυκινὰς κλονέοντα φάλαγγας
Ἕρμιον ἄμ πεδίον, φῶτα φερεμμελίην.
τοῦ μὲν ἄρ' οὔ ποτε πάμπαν ἐμέμψατο Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη
δριμὺ μένος κραδίης, εὖθ' ὅ γ' ἀνὰ προμάχους
σεύαιθ' αἱματόεν⟨τος ἐν⟩ ὑσμίνηι πολέμοιο . . .

in Colophon, and then moved to Smyrna (9W = 3 GP), ascribed by Strabo to the *Nanno*, could also be from the *Smyrneis* either if the title *Nanno* was given to the two books of Mimnermus' elegies as a whole—a hypothesis that seems to me unpersuasive—or if Strabo's ascription is mistaken. But it is a very brief narrative, similar in brevity as it is in content to Tyrtaeus 2 W = 1 GP, and it could well be part of a sympotic elegy.

So far as I know, since my discussion in 1986 nothing substantial has been added to the debate about the content or form of Semonides of Amorgos' *Early History of the Samians* (*Ἀρχαιολογία τῶν Σαμίων*).[13] It may be the same as the *ἐλεγείαν ἐν βιβλίοις β′* also attested by the *Suda*,[14] in which case it surely exceeded the length of poem that would fit in a single papyrus roll, i.e. *c.*2,000 lines. But it may only have occupied one of two books, or it may not have been an elegy at all, though if it was not an elegy and it was by Semonides, it must have been in some other verse form, whether hexameters or trochaic tetrameters (which in itself would be of considerable interest).

Nor has anything been added to our knowledge of Xenophanes of Colophon's *κτίσις* of Colophon and migration of Colophonians to Elea, of Panyassis' *Ἰωνικά* or of Ion's *κτίσις* of Chios, though I must concede that, as insisted very properly by Eva Stehle,[15] it is not certain that Xenophanes' poem was in elegiacs. However, in this context I would like to make two points about Panyassis, one elaborating my 1986 discussion, the other not made there at all. As I said in 1986, Panyassis' *Ἰωνικά* at 7,000 lines was evidently a more ambitious work than its predecessors: the title *Ἰωνικά* presumably indicates that it dealt not just with a single city, or with the colonization of one city by another like the poem of Xenophanes and, perhaps, that of Semonides, but treated the whole or a significant part of the Ionian settlement, and was hence on a larger scale. It is thus a datum

[13] T. Hubbard, 'Elemental Psychology and the Date of Semonides of Amorgos', *AJPh* 115 (1994), 175–97, has made a case for dating Semonides to the later 6th cent. I am not persuaded, but if he were right the possibly larger scale of Semonides' work (if it was later divided between two books) would fit well nearer in time to that of Xenophanes than to that of Mimnermus.

[14] See Bowie, 'Early Greek Elegy' [n. 1], 31 n. 97, for details.

[15] E. Stehle, 'Help Me to Sing, Muse, of Plataea', *Arethusa*, 29/2 (1996), 205–22 at 220 n. 59, revised as 'A Bard of the Iron Age and his Auxiliary Muse', in D. Boedeker and D. Sider (eds.), *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire* (Oxford, 2001), 106–19 (n. 59 of the original version is no longer present).

that has to be taken into account in the debate on whether general or local history came first. Whatever happened in prose works, the extant evidence for this sort of verse suggests movement from accounts of single poleis to an account putting together some sort of overarching narrative—of course, we do not know what sort, and it could have been wholly mythographic—concerning several poleis.

The second point may seem trivial, and it has already been made by others.[16] Panyassis was a relation, whether uncle or cousin, of Herodotus. Is it entirely coincidental that Panyassis seems to be the first to adapt an existing elegiac form to tie together traditions of several poleis, and that on one view, perhaps the most plausible, Herodotus is the first to move from local to panhellenic prose historiography?[17]

Before moving on to the new fragments of Simonides I would like to address one further issue concerning these early narrative elegies. At least one of them, the poem of Xenophanes, and also probably (but not, I must concede, demonstrably) Mimnermus' *Smyrneis*, dealt both with what we would call myth and with what we would call recent history. Tyrtaeus certainly dealt with recent history but may not have included early history or 'myth'; Semonides and Ion seem certainly to have handled early history (though the latter's work may have been in prose, not verse),[18] but we have no evidence whether or not either also included recent history. Did poets composing elegiacs think that the context in which they would be performed allowed or encouraged them to do something different from those using hexameters *κατὰ στίχον*? It is tempting to construct a schema which distributes material as follows:

(1) Hexameters treat only 'panhellenic' myth (so Homer, Hesiod's *Theogony*, and the cycle)—or myth which is tied in or merges with the early history of a polis (so Eumelus and the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*).

[16] e.g. by W. Rösler, '*Mnemosyne* in the *Symposion*', in O. Murray (ed.), *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposion* (Oxford, 1990), 230–7 at 236.

[17] On this controversy see most recently (and persuasively) R. L. Fowler, 'Herodotus and his Contemporaries', *JHS* 116 (1996), 62–87. The perception of Panyassis by later citizens of Halicarnassus as an important figure deserving honours is now documented by a new inscription published by S. Isager, 'The Pride of Halikarnassos: Editio Princeps of an Inscription from Salmakis', *ZPE* 123 (1998), 1–23.

[18] Robert Fowler has (orally) presented strong arguments to me that Ion's work was in prose. In that case my conjectural restoration of fr. 19 as a hexameter ('Early Greek Elegy' [n. 1], 32 n. 104), in which I later discovered I had been anticipated by G. Cerri, must be false.

(2) Elegiacs treat either the early history of a polis (inevitably bound up with myth) or recent history, or on occasion both, but do not treat 'panhellenic' mythical subjects that are not tied into the early history of a polis. We would thus have two overlapping but not coextensive areas of subject-matter.

There are, however, hints in our tradition about Archilochus and about another early poet that may require this picture to be modified. The two hints relating to Archilochus are complementary, and it might even be claimed that they support each other. A group of testimonia attests the survival at least until the second century AD of a poem in which Archilochus narrated Heracles' killing of the centaur Nessus.[19] One of the witnesses, Dio of Prusa, refers to criticism of Archilochus for having Deianeira 'chant a long story'—*ῥαψωδούσαν*—while Nessus is attempting to rape her, thus giving him ample opportunity to have his way with her.[20] It is of course possible that the narration was a mythical exemplum, but Archilochus' other exempla seem to be animal fables or the like,[21] and in any case the criticism of the length of the speech might rather suggest a self-standing narrative.

Our second witness is Longinus: contrasting poems that display *ὕψος* with those that are merely technically perfect, he asks:

> Would you rather be Homer or Apollonius? Is the Eratosthenes of that flawless little poem *Erigone* a greater poet than Archilochus, with his abundant, uncontrolled flood, that bursting of the divine spirit which is so hard to bring under the rule of law? Take lyric poetry: would you rather be Bacchylides than Pindar? Take tragedy: would you rather be Ion of Chios or Sophocles?[22] (Longinus 33. 4–5 trans. D. A. Russell)

We know the genre of Eratosthenes' 'flawless little poem' *Erigone*—it was an elegiac mythical narrative with the sort of aetiological

[19] 286 W, from Dio of Prusa 60. 1; 287 W from Σ *BE[4] on *Il*. 21. 237–89; 288 W from Σ A.R. 1. 1212–19a; 289 W from Plut. *De Herod. malign.* 14, 857 F.

[20] *φασὶ γὰρ οἱ μὲν τὸν Ἀρχίλοχον ληρεῖν ποιοῦντα τὴν Δηιάνειραν ἐν τῷ βιάζεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ Κενταύρου πρὸς τὸν Ἡρακλέα ῥαψῳδοῦσαν, ἀναμιμνήσκουσαν τῆς τοῦ Ἀχελῴου μνηστείας καὶ τῶν τότε γενομένων, ὥστε πολλὴν σχολὴν εἶναι τῷ Νέσσῳ ὅτι ἐβούλετο πρᾶξαι.*

[21] Animal fables in 172–81 W, 184–7 W; a story that looks like a fable in 184 W; the story of Coeranus and the dolphin in 192 W.

[22] *ἆρ' οὖν Ὅμηρος ἂν μᾶλλον ἢ Ἀπολλώνιος ἐθέλοις γενέσθαι; τί δέ; Ἐρατοσθένης ἐν τῇ Ἠριγόνῃ (διὰ πάντων γὰρ ἀμώμητον τὸ ποιημάτιον) Ἀρχιλόχου πολλὰ καὶ ἀνοικονόμητα παρασύροντος, κἀκείνης τῆς ἐκβολῆς τοῦ δαιμονίου πνεύματος ἣν ὑπὸ νόμον τάξαι δύσκολον, ἆρα δὴ μείζων ποιητής; τί δέ; ἐν μέλεσι μᾶλλον ἂν εἶναι Βακχυλίδης ἕλοιο ἢ Πίνδαρος, καὶ ἐν τραγῳδίᾳ Ἴων ὁ Χῖος ἢ νὴ Δία Σοφοκλῆς;*

streak we also find in Callimachus' hexameter *Hecale*.[23] But what poetry of Archilochus has Longinus in mind? Donald Russell, in what I take to be a rare moment of Homeric slumber, took the view that it was Archilochus' iambic poetry that was in Longinus' mind, and that for the purpose in hand iambic and elegiac poetry were being treated as belonging to the same genre. That they should be taken for any purpose as belonging to the same genre seems to me extremely improbable. It is almost inconceivable that this should be so in this context. What Longinus needed to contrast with the *Erigone* of Eratosthenes was a mid-length elegiac mythical narrative: it is noticeable how each of his other contrasts is scrupulously set out in generic terms, comparing like with like. Had he been thinking of Archilochus' iambic invective, he would have opened himself to the counter-argument 'Ah! It is easy enough to work up passion in invective, but that is not what Eratosthenes was trying to do.' I would therefore take this remark as evidence for knowledge by Longinus of a mid-length elegiac mythical narrative attributed to Archilochus. It is perhaps a conscious allusion when he uses for Eratosthenes' *Erigone* the very epithet first introduced into Greek literature by Archilochus to excuse his lost shield, *ἀμώμητον*, in the well-known elegiac poem (or fragment) 5. 2 W.

It may be possible to go a bit further. Dio criticized Archilochus for the uncontrolled outburst that he gave to Deianeira when she had better things to do, Longinus praises Archilochus for his abundant, uncontrolled flood. Do both authors have the same instance in mind? If two authors of the late first and early second century AD, Dio and Plutarch, know a Heracles poem, and if it is also noted by commentators whose work passed down into our scholia, and if no other mythical subject is securely attested for Archilochus, the chances are that one and only one such poem survived to this period, and that it is precisely this poem that the first-century AD writer of *Περὶ ὕψους* has in mind.

It is of course possible that such a narrative might have played a part in an account of the early history of Thasos or Paros, since both islands had a cult of Heracles. But none of the known stories about Heracles is actually set in Paros or Thasos, and if this poem's existence is to be accepted at all, it is more likely to fall into the category of narrative of panhellenic myth.

The other early poet who might be relevant is a much more

[23] Fragments in J. U. Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina* (Oxford, 1925), nos. 22–7.

shadowy figure than Archilochus, Sacadas of Argos. Athenaeus (13, 610 C) contrasts him with Stesichorus as naming, in a work entitled *The Sack of Troy*, very many of the warriors who were in the wooden horse.[24] The manuscripts of Athenaeus read *σακατου*, for which *Σακάδα τοῦ* was proposed by Casaubon and accepted by Bergk. Martin West did not admit the testimonium to his *Iambi et Elegi Graeci*, and Gentili and Prato register it as doubtful (T10).[25] Sacadas is credited both with *μέλη*, some of which seem to have been composed for choral performance, and with *ἐλεγεῖαι μεμελοποιημέναι*.[26] If *The Sack of Troy* was by Sacadas, it might have been either. One precarious argument can be offered that it was an elegiac poem. When Euripides departed from known tragic practice to give the eponymous heroine in his *Andromache* a song in elegiac couplets, its theme was a lament for the fall of Troy. While dissenting from Page's inference that Euripides, perhaps writing the *Andromache* for production in Argos, knew a tradition of Peloponnesian elegy that was specifically lamentatory,[27] I think it is not improbable that Euripides knew an elegiac *Sack of Troy* by Sacadas, and that in composing a play for production in Argos—and that is only one of a number of places outside Athens the play may have been produced, if indeed it was produced outside Athens at all—he chose to pay a compliment to an Argive poem that survived not only to his own time but until the end of the second century AD. This hypothesis might also help to explain the puzzling choice of elegiacs by Callimachus for his fifth hymn with its Argive setting.

What we had, then, until 1992, was a number of seventh-century poets who use elegiac narrative for early and/or recent local history (Tyrtaeus, Semonides, Mimnermus) and two, Archilochus and Sacadas, who seem to have used it not for such material but for panhellenic myth.[28] I shall return later (in Section III below) to

[24] Athenaeus 13, 610 C: *καὶ ἐὰν μέν τίς σου πύθηται τίνες ἦσαν οἱ εἰς τὸν δούρειον ἵππον ἐγκατακλεισθέντες, ἑνὸς καὶ δευτέρου ἴσως ἐρεῖς ὄνομα· καὶ οὐδὲ ταῦτ' ἐκ τῶν Στησιχόρου, σχολῇ γάρ, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς Σακάδου τοῦ Ἀργείου Ἰλίου Πέρσιδος· οὗτος γὰρ παμπόλλους τινὰς κατέλεξεν.*

[25] C. F. Hermann proposed to emend to *Ἀγία τοῦ*, and this was accepted by E. Hiller in 'Sakadas der Aulet', *RhM* 31 (1876), 76–88. Agias, however, is regularly mentioned both by other authors and by Athenaeus (3, 86 F) together with Dercyllos.

[26] Cf. ps.-Plut. *De musica* 8, 1134 A–B (Sacadas T10 GP).

[27] D. L. Page, 'The Elegiacs in Euripides' *Andromache*', in *Greek Poetry and Life: Essays Presented to Gilbert Murray on his Seventieth Birthday, January 2, 1936* (Oxford, 1936), 206–30; cf. Bowie, 'Early Greek Elegy' [n. 1], 23–5.

[28] Of course a poet from Argos (singing for an Argive audience?) could represent

points which might bear particularly on the development of prose historiography.

How was our picture changed by the publication in 1992 of fragments of narrative elegies of Simonides? Let me set out the facts briefly, although they are already well known from the voluminous secondary literature that their publication has catalysed.

The texts are fragments of a second-century Oxyrhynchus papyrus roll, published in 1992 by Peter Parsons as P. Oxy. 3965 (vol. lix), and very shortly after by Martin West in his second edition of *Iambi et Elegi Graeci*, vol. ii. These fragments turned out to overlap those of another second century roll from Oxyrhynchus, published by Edgar Lobel as P. Oxy. 2327 and by Martin West in the first edition of *Iambi et Elegi Graeci*, vol. ii, as *Adespota Elegiaca* 28–60, and the overlap vindicated these fragments for Simonides. The ascription to Simonides rests in part on an overlap of one of the poems with a citation in Stobaeus (4. 34. 28 *Σιμωνίδου*)—though the papyrus (frr. 19–20) shows that citation to be corrupt[29]—and in part on a quotation by Plutarch, *De Herodoti Malignitate*, 42, 872 D, of six lines, three of which overlap 3965 fr. 5, giving fr. 16 W. As in his quotation of some other lyric and elegiac poets,[30] Plutarch seems to be working directly from an edition of works of the poet, not from an anthology, so we now have evidence of three late first-/second-century copies of what is, at least in the case of the papyri, the same book of elegies of Simonides.

What was in that book? It contained both sympotic elegies—to one of which I shall return—but also, it seems, three poems narrating battles in the Persian wars:[31] one, represented by frr. 1–4 W,

the sack of Troy as part of the early history of his city in a way that poets from most cities could not.

[29] For a persuasive explanation of how the corruption in Stobaeus' text may have come about see D. Sider, 'As is the Generation of Leaves in Homer, Simonides, and Stobaios', *Arethusa*, 29/2 (1996), 263–72, repr. in Boedeker and Sider (eds.), *The New Simonides* [n. 15], 272–88. I am not convinced by T. Hubbard, '"New Simonides" or Old Semonides? Second Thoughts on *POxy* 3965, fr. 26', *Arethusa*, 29/2 (1996), 255–62, repr. in *The New Simonides*, 226–31, that the poem from which Stobaeus excerpts is to be ascribed to Semonides of Amorgos, though I agree that Alexandrian ascriptions of archaic poetry must sometimes have been erroneous.

[30] See E. L. Bowie, 'Plutarch's Citations of Early Elegiac and Iambic Poetry', in C. Schrader and V. R.-J. Vela (eds.), *Plutarco y la historia* (Zaragoza, 1997), 99–108.

[31] For a fuller and more cautious account see I. C. Rutherford, 'The New Simonides: Towards a Commentary', *Arethusa* 29/2 (1996), 167–92 at 167–73, and (on the Plataea poem) 174–88, repr. in Boedeker and Sider (eds.), *The New Simonides* [n. 15], 33–55 at 33–8 and 38–50. Rutherford rightly highlights the problems in ac-

seems to be *The Battle of Artemisium*, ἡ ἐπ' Ἀρτεμισίωι ναυμαχία, long known of from the *Suda*, though until the papyrus appeared many thought that the *Suda* was wrong to describe it as an elegiac poem; the second, represented by fr. 5 W and probably frr. 6–9 W, seems to relate to the battle of Salamis, said by the *Suda* to have been recounted by Simonides in a lyric poem (μελικῶς); and the third and longest sequence—frr. 10–18 W—to a poem not previously attested by name about the preparations for and action of the battle of Plataea.

What features in this Plataea poem are of especial interest for an investigation into the development of prose historiography?

The poem must have been quite long: the narrative is economical but not hasty. Departure of the Spartans from the Eurotas valley under the command of Pausanias is told at 11. 29–34 W; they reach the Isthmus, Megara, and Eleusis 11. 35–40 W. A prophecy, perhaps the same as that of Tisamenus in Herodotus 9. 36, comes in 14. 3–6 W,[32] and praise of Corinthians at 15–16 W. The narrative proper is preceded by a hymn to Achilles (11. 1–20 W). Peter Parsons thought the poem must have been at least 100 lines long: I would guess rather several hundred lines. It seems, therefore, to fall in or near to the class of narrative elegy I have just discussed. In, or near? I am less confident than some scholars[33] that this poem fell in the same class.

First, there is length. As I have said, it seems that Semonides' *Early History of the Samians* was long enough to be given either its own book or more probably divided between two books in the Alexandrian edition: this suggests something nearer the 2,000 lines that is given as the length of Xenophanes' *Foundation of Colophon and Colonisation of Elea* by Diogenes Laertius. By contrast, the grouping of an elegy on Plataea with either one or two on Artemi-

cepting two separate elegiac poems by Simonides on Artemisium and Salamis, as proposed by M. L. West, 'Simonides Redivivus', *ZPE* 98 (1993), 1–14. I am not persuaded by the radical suggestion of D. Obbink, 'The Hymnic Structure of the New Simonides', *Arethusa*, 29/2 (1996), 193–203 at 202–3 n. 27, repr. in revised form in *The New Simonides*, 65–85 at 81–4, that the rolls contained only a single poem on Plataea, to the *sphragis* of which the apparently sympotic fragments belong.

[32] Rutherford, 'The New Simonides' [n. 31], 185 = Boedeker and Sider (eds.), *The New Simonides* [n. 15], 48, conjectures that it may have been spoken by a god.

[33] e.g. D. Boedeker, 'Simonides on Plataea: Narrative Elegy, Mythodic History', *ZPE* 107 (1995), 217–29; more cautiously in 'Heroic Historiography: Simonides and Herodotus on Plataea', *Arethusa*, 29/2 (1996), 223–42, repr. in Boedeker and Sider (eds.), *The New Semonides* [n. 15], 120–34, and, with D. Sider, p. vii of the *Arethusa* volume.

sium and Salamis in the same book as at least three sympotic elegies should indicate that the average length of the longer poems can hardly have exceeded 900 lines, and may well have been less than 600.

Second, but less clearly diagnostic, there is theme: Semonides' and Xenophanes' poems certainly focused in part on the early history of poleis, and arguably so did a part of that of Mimnermus. Simonides composed his poem about recent events, much more recent for him than the reign of Theopompus was for Tyrtaeus—who set Theopompus in his and his audience's grandfathers' generation. Whether Simonides' subject was startlingly more recent than the part of the *Smyrneis* in which Mimnermus handled fighting between Gyges and Smyrna is less clear. The *Suda* offers 632–629 BC as Mimnermus' floruit, but there seems to have been no firm basis for this, and the eclipse of the sun that he mentioned (20 W) was very probably that of 648 BC (as was that invoked in Archilochus 122 W), which might indicate that he was already composing then. If the battle by the River Hermos, mentioned in 14W as something for which he had to resort to the testimony of an earlier generation, both figured in the *Smyrneis* and was (as neatly conjectured by Martin West) the source of his own name, Mimnermus, then he could as a *νέος* have been composing his narrative about events no more than two decades before its first performance. Simonides' subject, no more than a decade before composition and probably nearer to a year, perhaps represents only a small step forward from that of Mimnermus.

Other features link the Plataea poem quite closely with what we know of these earlier elegiac examples.

The use of speech is one feature, and might perhaps be thought unremarkable, given Greek narrators' propensity to use direct speech in a wide variety of genres. But it should at least be noted; and in our extant fragments of the poem the speech takes a particularly grand form, a prophecy, perhaps by the *μάντις* Tisamenus (14 W). We may compare the oracles that seem to have figured in Tyrtaeus' *Eunomia* (2. 2–4 W, 4 W) and in epic the speech of Calchas in *Iliad* 1 (just as there was too a speech by Calchas at Aulis in the *Cypria*). One might guess that oracles and prophecies figured in the foundations of Amorgos, Colophon, and Elea, and indeed speculate on the ultimate source of the oracles delivered to Archilochus' father Telesicles in the biographic tradition.

Another feature is the involvement of the gods: ever present in mythical epic, they had been invoked as authorizing Sparta's claims to Lacedaemon by Tyrtaeus 2. 12–13 W: 'for Zeus himself, son of Cronus, husband of fair-garlanded Hera, gave us this city' (above, n. 3). One of Simonides' poems, most likely that on Artemisium, seems to have involved Zetes and Calais, and a prophecy by the Old Man of the Sea (3. 5–14 W). The gods are, in a sense, even closer to the action in the Plataea poem, where the Spartans leave their city (11. 30–1 W) accompanied by the Tyndaridae and Menelaus. Now this may mean no more than that cult statues of the Tyndaridae and Menelaus were ceremonially carried, as we know that they were. But it might also be that the regular involvement of gods in *μῦθοι* set in the distant past suggested to Simonides that portrayal of their accompanying the Spartan army on its northward march to Plataea would contribute to his heroization of the participants in that conflict.

Even if Simonides is suggesting that the gods themselves were present, we need not say that he is here drifting into fictionality. Attic tradition recalled Pan's appearance to Philippides in Arcadia in 490 (Hdt. 6. 105), and the Greeks invoked the assistance of Ajax and Telamon from Salamis, and sent a ship to Aegina specially to get the Aeacidae—represented presumably by cult statues—to give help in the battle of Salamis (Hdt 8. 64, 83–4). It is perhaps also worth noting a precedent for incorporation of divine intervention into a narrative of recent military events. Archilochus, in his long tetrameter poems (to which I shortly turn), where he seems to have given an account of Thasian military engagements with Thracians and Naxians, an account in which Archilochus himself figured, had Athena (94 W) and Zeus (98 W) play a part in deciding the outcome of the battle as a whole and seems very likely to have claimed that he himself was saved by Hermes (95 W cf. Horace, *Odes*, 2. 7. 13). More than a century and a half before Simonides' account of Plataea, then, a poet had handled recent history in a similar manner to epic's handling of 'mythical' battles.

A third feature that links the Plataea poem with the early-and-later history type is the opening with a formal prooemion. We have noted that Mimnermus' *Smyrneis* opened with an address to the Muses (above, n. 10). We cannot tell how long Mimnermus' prooemion was, but it is unlikely to have extended to the thirty lines that are the least we must allow for Simonides' opening. That

opening is also different in another, surprising way: the initial address is not to the Muses, but to Achilles; only when that address is concluded with a formula regularly used for transition or closure in hymns—*ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲ*]*ν νῦν χαῖρε* , 11. 19 W—does Simonides call upon the Muse.

This address to Achilles clearly has several functions. Contemplation of a great hellenic hero—unquestionably the greatest hellenic hero—who lost his life in a campaign against an eastern power that culminated in that power's destruction was an effective mode of heroizing the fallen at Plataea.[34] One function, then, of the hymn or invocation to Achilles is to create a link between *τὸ μυθῶδες* and a narrative whose very recent subject-matter may have seemed to offer more constraints than that of some poems in the genre in which Simonides was composing—thus of course shifting it *ἐπὶ τὸ μυθῶδες*. However, Simonides gives no hint that Achilles' part in the tale of Troy should be seen as to any degree fictional: in drawing our attention to how the *κλέος* of Achilles was due to Homer, he describes the latter as having received truth from the Muses (11. 16–17 W—if [*ἀλη θ*]*είην* is the correct supplement). The main point of this introduction of Homer is, of course, to remind us of Simonides' own role in conferring *κλέος* upon the victors of Plataea, a second function of the Achilles hymn.

In this context it would not be appropriate to pursue the fascinating but as yet unresolved question of where the Plataea poem was first meant to be performed. I note only that its elaborate opening suits a substantial and formal composition (cf. Mimnermus 13 W, above n. 10), supporting the hypothesis of festive and perhaps competitive performance, for which we may compare Aeschylus' alleged competition with Simonides for an elegy commemorating the Marathon dead.[35]

(*b*) I now turn to my second category of early verse narrative in which ancestors of historiography might be sought, narrative in trochaic tetrameters, so far represented only by Archilochus.

[34] For a full exploration of how the poem heroizes the Plataea dead see D. Boedeker, 'The New Simonides and Heroization at Plataea', in N. Fisher and H. van Wees (eds.), *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence* (London, 1998), 231–49, repr. in revised form in D. Boedeker and D. Sider (eds.), *The New Simonides* [n. 15], 148–63, taking further her important contribution to the *Arethusa* volume ('Heroic Historiography' [n. 33]).

[35] *Vita Aeschyli* 8 = *TGrF* iii. 33s: Aeschylus left for Sicily *κατὰ δὲ ἐνίους ἐν τῷ εἰς τοὺς ἐν Μαραθῶνι τεθνηκότας ἐλεγείῳ ἡσσηθεὶς Σιμωνίδῃ*.

Long fragments from at least two substantial poems (starting with 88 W and 105 W), many from the Mnesiepes and Sosthenes inscriptions on Paros, include narrative of battles of the Thasians against Naxians or Thracians. How substantial they were is not clear: the Mnesiepes inscription illustrates its prose narrative with sequences of up to 30 tetrameters (89 W). The Sosthenes inscription picks out sequences of 7 (93a W, 94 W) and 22 lines (98 W); the conjunction of two papyri yielded a sequence of 45 lines (91 W), albeit very scrappily preserved. It would be surprising if any of these poems was as short as the 100-line elegy of Solon entitled *Salamis*. I would guess that there were a number of poems of *c.*200 lines, but it is a guess.

It is also hard to discern how much was narrative for narrative's sake and how much was narrative subordinated to exhortation. Fragment 89 W is apparently cited by Mnesiepes to illustrate Archilochus' enthusiasm for his *patris*, and Mnesiepes says that Archilochus urged his (?) fellow citizens to help: *καὶ παρεκάλε*[*σεν* ---] *βοηθεῖν ἀπροφ*[*ασίστως* . . . The whole seems to have been addressed to one Erxies (88 W, 89. 28 W), more likely, I think, a mortal than a god.[36] That 1–13 was narrative seems to be secured by the past tenses in 12 and 13 (*ἀπέθρισαν* and *ἤριπεν*), and 14. But *ταῦτά μοι θυμός* at 14 may mark, with a formula like that used by Solon at 4. 30, a transition to exhortation, reinforced by *γνῶθί νυν* at 17, and what follows may be details of Archilochus' recommendations.

Fr. 91 W also seems to look both forwards (14–15 *μηδ' ὁ Τα*.*νταλου* .*ίθος* | *τῆσδ' ὑπὲρ νήσου κρεμάσθω*.) and backwards (30),[37] and one might argue that Plutarch's citation of 91. 14–15 W[38] to illustrate how a *πολιτικὸς λόγος* requires *ἱστορίας καὶ μύθους* implies that the poem in which he found these lines was seen by him as a symbouleutic political *λόγος*.

Frr. 93a–101 W may all belong together, and both the way they are cited by the Sosthenes stone[39] and their syntax suggest that they were entirely narrative: note the past tenses *ἀνήγαγεν* (93a. 5), *ἐποίησαν* (93a. 7), *ὤρινεν* (94. 3), *εἶλες* (96. 5), *ἐπήγομ*[*εν*] (98. 14), *ἐμάρψαμεν* (101. 1), *εἶμεν* (101. 2). But there might have been an

[36] Despite Martin West's inference (*Studies in Elegy and Iambus* [n. 8]), 126, from *ὁ θεός* in the text following the excerpt.

[37] At least if the *ἔ*.*λ*.*κ'* (printed by M. L. West in *Delectus ex Elegis et Iambis Graecis* (Oxford, 1980)) or *ε*.*χ* (printed by West in *IEG*[2]) of the papyrus represents a past tense.

[38] At *Praecepta reipublicae gerendae* 6, 803 A.

[39] e.g. 94 W *καὶ ἐν τούτοις διασαφεῖ πάλιν ὡς ἐνίκησαν καρτερῶς τοὺς Ναξίους* . . .

opening, like the address to Erxies in 88, the address to Glaucus in 105, or like the possible opening addressing fellow citizens, ⟨ὦ⟩ *λιπερνῆτες πολῖται*, in 109 W, which began by offering recommendations or predictions and then supported these by narrative of what had already happened. Frr. 106–8 W and 111 W certainly seem to look forward: note the imperatives of various sorts in 106 W (*ὑφώμεθα*, 106. 2; *μεμνεώμεθα*, 106. 4;]*ἄπισχε, μηδὲ . . . ἐμβάλητις* 106. 5; *προμήθεσαι*, 106. 7) and 111 W (*θάρσυνε*), and the future *καθαυανεῖ* in 107. 1.

Before concluding this first section it might be appropriate to note that the iambic poems of Solon, both iambic trimeters (36–8 W) and trochaic tetrameters (32–3 W), clearly had long sections of narrative. It is perhaps artificial to set this aside because it is narrative articulated around the actions of the speaker, especially since some of Archilochus' narrative takes that form (e.g. 101 W). But at least it is separated from narration of others' actions by the crucial criterion of authority, to which I later come: in the first instance, at any rate, an individual's claim to have done *x*, *y*, and *z* does not need further support, whereas a poet or a prose writer narrating what third parties did is at once vulnerable to the question 'How do you know?'

II

I now wish to assess how many of these traces might be securely or conjecturally claimed to be composed for sympotic, and how many for other, locations of performance.

First (*a*) elegy:

The length of some of these elegiac poems, their formal openings—Mimnermus 13 W's address to the Muses, Simonides 10–11 W's to Achilles—and their concern with the affairs of the polis as a whole seem to me to indicate that the longer narrative elegies were intended for first performance not in a sympotic but in some form of festive, perhaps agonistic, context. In the case of Panyassis' *Ἰωνικά* it is tempting to think of a pan-Ionian festival, but only parts of his 7,000-line poem are likely to have been performed on any one occasion, and it may be that he assembled separately performed sections in a form which was only on this large scale in a version for

circulation as a written text. That does not, of course, exclude the possibility that when a long poem was a box-office success parts of it were sung in symposia. But I am reluctant to believe that within a sympotic context the singing of a whole poem of several hundred lines would be acceptable.

Whether Tyrtaeus' *Eunomia* was composed for first performance in a festive or sympotic context will remain uncertain until (if ever) we have more evidence on its length and its articulation of narrative and exhortation (cf. above, Section I). Wolfgang Rösler may be correct in claiming a sympotic context of performance.[40]

On present evidence it seems quite probable that Solon's *Salamis* (1–3 W) of 100 lines (Plut. *Sol.* 8. 2) was sympotic: it was clearly exhortatory, and if there were parts which narrated the earlier stages of Attic involvement with Salamis, these parts were surely subordinated to the exhortatory thrust.

If Mimnermus 9 W is from the *Nanno*, it was probably composed for a sympotic context of performance. There is little if anything in this that an early prose historian could not have learnt from Homer, unless we see Mimnermus' description of the group with which the first persons plural associate him as 'leaders of dire violence' (*ἀργαλέης ὕβριος ἡγεμόνες*) as carrying Homer's problematization of violence a stage nearer to that of Thucydides. Certainly there are plenty retrospective narratives in speeches by Homeric characters with both first-person verbs and similar levels of detail. I am therefore reluctant to go as far as did Rösler when discussing this and other fragments, some of them lyric, when he claimed that 'sympotic *mnemosyne* is clearly one of the roots, hitherto little recognised, of the growth of historiography in the fifth century'.[41]

Second (*b*) iambic poetry:

The performance context of Archilochus' tetrameter poems is uncertain. However, two openings address individuals, 88 W Erxies and 105 W a known *ἑταῖρος* of Archilochus, Glaucus. We have no trace of an opening constructed around a formal invocation to a Muse. If these are correctly linked to the long pieces of military narrative preserved on stone and on papyrus (89–104 W, 106–7 W), then a private and perhaps sympotic context must be quite probable. At the same time the egalitarian participatory character of symposia must be kept in mind, indicating either that my suggestion

[40] '*Mnemoysne* in the *Symposion*' [n. 16], 234–5. [41] Ibid. 236.

of 200 lines as the poems' length should be the upper limit or that their intended context was not sympotic after all. Another tetrameter poem seems to have begun with an address to Archilochus' fellow citizens, ⟨ὦ⟩ λιπερνῆτες πολῖται (109 W): does this point to a public context of performance? Not necessarily, because it is quite conceivable that a symposiast addressing a selection of his fellow citizens, that is, his ἑταῖροι, should pick out their status precisely as citizens in making recommendations that affect the polis as a whole.

III

Finally I consider in what ways this earlier verse material might have contributed to the way early prose historiography developed.

(1) The issue on which I touched when mentioning Solon's account of his political actions is the most interesting. Homer and Hesiod had claimed to derive their mythical narrative from the Muses, although at *Odyssey* 8. 488–91 Odysseus compliments Demodocus for his account of the fall of Troy in a teasing way that raises the question of *how* a poet knows the story he sings:

> Either a Muse taught you, daughter of Zeus, or Apollo:
> for it is very much as it should be that you sing the fate of the Achaeans,
> all that they did and suffered, and all that the Achaeans toiled,
> as if indeed you were yourself there or had heard from another.

How Mimnermus or Semonides explained their knowledge of the earlier history of their polis is not clear, save that Mimnermus still invoked the Muses. It was suggested by Deborah Boedeker[42] that Mimnermus' distinction between two types of Muses corresponded to the two different types of information offered in the *Smyrneis*, with the older Muses dispensing knowledge of early and, in our terms, mythical events and the younger Muses more recent events. This is an attractive suggestion, though it is equally possible that, if any distinction was drawn in terms of the type of information purveyed, it was between panhellenic, Homeric, and Hesiodic myth and deeds associated with the κτίσις of a particular polis. But without more of Mimnermus' invocation all this remains speculation.

[42] In Rutherford, 'The New Simonides' [n. 31], 176 n. 33 = Boedeker and Sider (eds.), *The New Simonides* [n. 14], 42 n. 41.

Certainly knowledge of recent political and military events had to be presented differently from the more distant, 'mythical' past, and for events in the immediately preceding generation the claim that the tradition offered is derived from mortal authority is made in Mimnermus 14. 1–2 W *τοῖον ἐμέο προτέρων πεύθομαι*. As for very recent events, Archilochus represented himself as taking part in some of the events he narrated:[43] none of our surviving scraps has him insist that for this reason his account is to be accepted (and I would not see Archilochus 1 W as setting out to do this), but perhaps he could assume that his audience would take his account to be reliable if it was of events in which he took part.

We have seen that the Muse still has a role to play for Simonides (11. 21 W), even if her description as an ally, *ἐπίκουρον*, may give her a subordinate role, as suggested by Eva Stehle.[44] There is no hint in our surviving part of any of Simonides' Persian war poems that he raises the issue of the source of his account, though he does stress its *ἀλήθεια* (11. 17 W).

No neat progression can be traced that might be seen as leading on to Hecataeus' claim to write what seemed to him correct (F 1) or to Herodotus' fundamental distinction (1. 5. 3) between irresoluble contradictions in traditions about the distant past and more recent events about which he can claim knowledge. The relevance of an eyewitness source is already apparent in the *Odyssey* and Mimnermus, but a generation after Hecataeus Simonides still (albeit for his own heroizing ends) appeals to the Muse. Herodotus' claims to antiquarian autopsy (e.g. 2. 143) have a very different flavour from Archilochus' first-person battle narrative.

(2) The self-confidence with which a historian approached his task and his claims for the immortalizing role of his work can more confidently be claimed as an inheritance from verse: Simonides' heroizing stance foreshadows the opening of Herodotus with its claim to ensure that men's deeds and artefacts shall not be *ἀκλεᾶ* and Thucydides' claim to give a definitive and eternal account.[45] But as Simonides' flourishes make clear, the idea that a literary composition can confer *κλέος* was established by Homer, and what-

[43] Accepting Zieliński's supplement in 95. 3 W *πῆ μ' ἔσωσ'Ἐρμ[ῆς*; and *ἑπτὰ γαρ νεκρῶν πεσόντων, οὓς ἐμάρψαμεν ποσίν, χείλιοι φονῆές εἰμεν* 101 W.

[44] 'Help Me to Sing' [n. 15], 208–12 = Boedeker and Sider (eds.), *The New Simonides* [n. 15], 108–10.

[45] 1. 22. 4, with a gloss at 2. 41. 4–5.

ever we may guess about Mimnermus, it is not in narrative but in sympotic elegy (Theognis 237–54) and in other sympotic poetry (Ibycus 282. 47–8 P) that we find it between Homer and Simonides.

(3) In another phenomenon which might be seen as related to the narrator's foregrounding of his role there is perhaps a progression. Both elegiac and iambic narratives offer more overt moral comment on actions of both citizens and their enemies than was characteristic of Homeric epic. Thus Archilochus 93a W speaks contemptuously of non-Greek enemies as 'Thracian dogs', *κυσὶ Θρέϊξιν*, while 96. 1–4 W seems to have criticized for some incomprehensible action an individual, Glaucus, who was both the addressee of the poem and an actor in its narrative; 101 W characterizes the group of which the poet presents himself as a member as 'a thousand slaughterers'.[46] Fr. 102 W uses the unflattering term 'the misery of the Panhellenes' (*Πανελλήνων ὀϊζύς*) of his fellow settlers in Thasos. Perhaps Tyrtaeus 5 W's laudatory presentation of the warriors of Theopompus' generation[47] was an example of the same trope as Mimnermus 14 W,[48] which, whether from the *Smyrneis* or from a sympotic poem, offers a brief characterization of an earlier generation's hero (and a very brief narrative of his exploits) in order to voice blame of some contemporary action or individuals. Unflattering comparison with the qualities of an earlier generation is already to be found in Homer, but of course in a character's and not in the poet's mouth.[49]

Two interwoven strands in Herodotean writing might be seen as descendants of these features: the constant imposition of moral colour on his narrative, and his occasional explicit foregrounding of his own assessment, e.g. at 7. 139 on the importance for Greece of the Athenian decision in 480 BC.

What I have been discussing might be characterized as aspects of presentation. There are also two elements of content for which elegiac and iambic narrative might have been relevant.

(4) The most important of these is divine intervention. We find the Homeric notion that Zeus' scales are deciding the outcome of a battle in Archilochus' account of a battle at 91. 30 W; Athena's intervention is mentioned at 94. 1–6 W; and perhaps the rescue of the poet by Hermes at 95. 4 W (cf. above, with n. 43). Simonides

[46] Cf. n. 43 for the text.

[47] *αἰχμηταὶ πατέρων ἡμετέρων πατέρες*, 5. 6.

[48] For the text see n. 12 above.

[49] e.g. Agamemnon's criticism of Diomedes, *Il*. 4. 365–400.

introduced Zetes and Calais, and perhaps the Old Man of the Sea, in what may be his account of Artemisium (3 W); the Dioscuri and Menelaus (11. 30–1 W), and perhaps Zeus (14. 7 W) and Ares (14. 9–10 W) in his Plataea poem. Deborah Boedeker has argued convincingly[50] that Simonides' account may here be to some extent responsible for the elements of supernatural intervention admitted by Herodotus to his account of Artemisium and Plataea.

(5) The presence of speeches in early elegy (in Mimnermus 13a W and Simonides 14 W) is in one sense unremarkable, given their presence both in epic and in 'lower' forms of poetry like Archilochean and Hipponactian *iamboi*.[51] But I do not think we should take it as inevitable that Greek prose historiography was to maintain this narrative convention, which, as Thucydides (1. 22) and probably already Herodotus (3. 80. 1) were aware, raises such fundamental questions about accuracy of reporting. It is possible that the presence of speeches in these verse narratives about 'historical' events could have played a part in their retention by prose historiography.

(6) A further element to become important for both Herodotus (1. 1–5) and Thucydides (1. 1–21) is the comparison of contemporary with earlier conflicts. Our only clear case, but it is very clear, is Simonides' elaborate and presumably successful attempt to persuade his audience to see the Persian wars as closely comparable to the Greek expedition to Troy, and hence himself to Homer. Would the opening of Herodotus have been the same if he had not known Simonides' poem, or would Thucydides have felt it so necessary to demonstrate that the Peloponnesian war was of greater magnitude than the Trojan or Persian wars?

(7) Finally, we might claim an attempt to evolve a chronology for local traditions on the basis of generations in Tyrtaeus 5. 6 W (with the phrase *αἰχμηταὶ πατέρων ἡμετέρων πατέρες*). I would not like to give this much weight. In the context of Tyrtaeus' line the purpose of noting that Theopompus' conquest of Messenia was two generations ago does not seem so much to establish a firm chronology for the events as to impose a moral burden on his audience by stressing that it was their lineal and recent ancestors who had conquered the Messenians. The idea of using generations to establish a chrono-

[50] 'Heroic Historiography' [n. 34], 237 = Boedeker and Sider (eds.), *The New Simonides* [n. 15], 130.

[51] e.g. Archilochus 23 W, 177 W, 196a W; Hipponax 3a, 36.

logy was surely an obvious one, and its effectiveness must have been brought out more clearly by genealogical catalogues in hexameters than by such passages as that of Tyrtaeus.

Some of these seven features have their origin in hexameter epic, and it will never be clear which of them would have persisted into historiography without the reinforcement of their adoption by narrative elegiac or iambic poetry. As in so many artistic developments, it may be that a single decision by a single artist—Mimnermus' elaborate invocation of Muses in 13 W, or citation of the evidence of *πρότεροι* in 14. 2 W, or Simonides' decision to heroize the Plataean dead by comparison with Achilles or to retain divine intervention—played a crucial part. Equally or more likely, however, the first cases of such crucial stages were found in poems now lost to us, perhaps indeed poems which did not survive the generation of the poet. It is also worth noting some features that might have been adopted by fifth-century Greek historians but were not. The narratives of Archilochus (101 W), Tyrtaeus (2. 12–15 W), and Mimnermus (9 W)—all of them, perhaps, for sympotic and not festival performance—use first persons plural to align the performer with other members of the same city. Herodotus and Thucydides used third persons plural to give a greater impression of objectivity (as already had Simonides), and the use of the first person plural of the author's side remained very much the exception in later Greek historiography.

IV

The picture that can currently be reconstructed is not a tidy one, and the small proportion we have of the pertinent material should caution us against thinking that it is likely to be very near the truth. The publication of the Simonides poem on Plataea may have reinforced the case for supposing that archaic Greece knew certain sorts of narrative elegy, but it also revealed a sort which had features that could not have been predicted from what was previously known. Taken together, the old and the new material extend our understanding of the background to fifth-century prose historiography, but there remains even more that it would be valuable to know.

4

Hecataeus: From Genealogy to Historiography

LUCIO BERTELLI

1. *A New Model for the Origin of Historiography?*

THE traditional view of the 'birth of historiography' as a stage in the natural evolution of Greek culture from *mythos* to *logos*—from the 'gläubiger Nacherzähler' to the 'kritischer Historiker', as Jacoby put it[1]—has recently been replaced by a more sophisticated interpretation that points to the technological revolution represented by the introduction of writing in the eighth century as the unique—or the most important—factor explaining the breakthrough of new forms of critical knowledge in Greece. Besides emphasizing the influence of alphabetic writing on the transmission of knowledge, this 'technological' explanation also stresses the potential for abstraction engendered by this medium—'the critical virtues of writing', as Detienne calls them—that made possible a different mental attitude towards (oral) tradition. The latter, once fixed in written texts, became exposed to cross-checking and confutation in all its parts. The most typical products of this script culture should be Ionic historiography and philosophy.[2]

[1] F. Jacoby, 'Griechische Geschichtsschreibung', *Antike*, 2 (1926), 1–29 at 8, repr. in *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtsschreibung*, ed. H. Bloch (Leiden, 1956), 73–99 at 79; cf. id., 'Über die Entwicklung der griechischen Historiographie und den Plan einer neuen Sammlung der griechischen Historikerfragmente', *Klio*, 9 (1909), 80–123 at 83, repr. in *Abhandlungen*, 16–64 at 20; id., *Atthis: The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens* (Oxford, 1949), 199. This is a generally accepted view; cf. M. I. Finley, *The Use and Abuse of History*, 2nd edn. (London 1975), 13 ff.; Ch. W. Fornara, *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome*, 2nd edn. (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1988), 4–5; K. Meister, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung: Von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des Hellenismus* (Stuttgart, 1990), 17 ff.

[2] J. Goody and I. Watt, 'The Consequences of Literacy', *Comparative Studies in*

Besides the general criticism that it applies a sort of 'technological determinism' to the shifting from oral culture to literacy, this theory is liable to some more specific objections concerning the beginnings of Greek historiography:

(1) Even in the special conditions of Greece (absence of a scribal class, unrestricted access to writing without any form of sacralization or monopolization by a religious or political power), the use of writing alone is not enough to explain the rise of the critical mental attitude towards tradition which is typical of Greek historiography from its start.[3] Otherwise, one wonders why the writing down of the Homeric epic from the mid–late eighth century onwards or, even more so, Hesiod's undoubtedly written theogonic and catalogic poetry did not bring about any form of critical or polemical attitude towards tradition: although here we find a selective use of tradition, the 'agonistic intertextuality'[4] which characterizes Greek historiography is still conspicuously absent. Therefore, in the transition from oral culture to script culture in Greece, we should envisage at least two successive stages, which correspond to two different ways of using writing:

(*a*) The *fixing* of oral tradition in its main elements—i.e. epic, theogonic, and genealogical poetry—a stage in which 'die Schrift . . . steht . . . im Dienst des gesprochenen Wortes'[5] and written culture maintains the style (formularity) and content of oral tradition, but

Society and History, 5 (1962–3), 304–45; J. Goody, *The Domestication of the Savage Mind* (Cambridge, 1977); A. Havelock, 'The Alphabetization of Homer', in E. A. Havelock and J. P. Hershbell (eds.), *Communication Arts in the Ancient World* (New York, 1978), 3–21; id., *The Muse Learns to Write: Reflections on Orality and Literacy from Antiquity to the Present* (New Haven and London, 1986); W. J. Ong, *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word* (London and New York, 1982), esp. ch. 4; a stimulating critical survey of the 'technogical theory' in Ø. Andersen, 'Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit im frühen Griechentum', *A&A* 33 (1987), 29–44, and R. Thomas, *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge, 1992), ch. 2; see also F. Hartog, 'Écriture, généalogies, archives, histoire en Grèce ancienne', in M.-M. Mactoux and E. Geny (eds.), *Mélanges Pierre Lévêque*, v. *Anthropologie et société* (Paris, 1990), 177–88; the quotation from M. Detienne comes from *L'Invention de la mythologie* (Paris, 1981), 134.

[3] As rightly pointed out by Thomas, *Literacy and Orality* [n. 2], 24: 'writing does not descend onto a blank slate', but can only 'exaggerate or strengthen tendencies already present'.

[4] See J. Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung, und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen* (Munich, 1992), 286–7.

[5] Andersen, 'Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit' [n. 2], 33.

in a differentiated way and with noteworthy variations in the different genres.

(*b*) A second stage, characterized by *exegesis* and *critical use of tradition* (which is, at this point, fixed in written form), which aim not merely at its conservation, but rather at its interpretation towards new ends. It is in this context that both historiography may appear, conceived of as cross-checking and criticism of genealogical tradition, and a reflection about nature freed from theogonic forerunners.

(2) The monocausal explanation of the birth of historiography through the technology of writing ignores the peculiar conditions of its use in Greece, and so risks blurring the specific characteristics of Greek historical writing from its very beginnings, making it dangerously similar to other forms of recording of the past found in Near Eastern cultures. Goody's suggestion of an analogy between early Greek historiography on the one hand, and Sumeric 'lists of events', Egyptian registrations of a similar kind, and Hebrew historical literature on the other, is symptomatic.[6] It is true that writing allows the recording of lists—of events, kings, dates, up to the composition of documents as complex as the Hittite Annals; but nevertheless both the specific features of Greek ἱστορίη—the criticism of tradition and the search for a rational or internal explanation of events—are absent from all of the cultures mentioned by Goody.[7] Apart from other differences, such as the autonomy from any form of justification of a centralized power (which, incidentally, did not exist in Greece), or the absence of any trace of officiality or sacrality related to national identity or to a particular religious creed, the recording of the past in Greece does not take the shape of a 'historiography of sin and salvation', according to Assmann's definition of the shared character of historical records in the three great oriental 'writing cultures', Mesopotamic, Hittite, and Hebrew.[8] From its very beginning the reconstruction of the past in Greek historiography raises the 'technical' problem of checking the sources, which is unthinkable in oriental sacralized traditions.

[6] See Goody, *The Domestication of the Savage Mind* [n. 2], 91.

[7] On this peculiarity of Greek historiography see the straightforward position taken by A. Momigliano, 'Tradition and the Classical Historian', *History and Theory*, 11 (1972), 279–93 at 282, repr. in *Quinto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico* (Rome, 1975), 13–31 at 19; id., *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1990).

[8] Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis*, [n. 4], 243 ff.

After having defined an acceptable truth standard, not according to the canons of a sacralized tradition—the 'pact' between the deity and men—but to his own personal judgement, the Greek historian would go on organizing the data of tradition, following ever changing ideological views and in close contact with his political or cultural environment. Such a use of the past—autonomous and *arbitrary*, in the sense that it is not regulated by guidelines fixed by political power or tradition, but only by the historian's individual choice—is possible only under the conditions of a script culture, writing being the 'enabling factor' for the individual and critical approach to tradition; only under such conditions does the possibility exist of 'studying' the oral tradition[9] and organizing the data according to new categories of time and space, which in their turn make it possible to place past and present in a continuous sequence. From this perspective, however, writing is not the *cause* of the development, but it regains its role as a necessary *instrument* for this new dimension of literacy, a role that is more suited to the specific Greek situation.

Because of the embeddedness of Near Eastern historical literature in archival practices and records, the (misleading) analogy postulated by Goody between Greek historiography and this form of recording the past inevitably awakes the ghost of Dionysius of Halicarnassus' theory regarding the birth of Greek historiography. According to Dionysius, early Greek historical writing was a mere transcript of *παρὰ τοῖς ἐπιχωρίοις μνῆμαι κατὰ ἔθνη τε καὶ κατὰ πόλεις, ⟨ἢ⟩ εἴ τ' ἐν ἱεροῖς εἴ τ' ἐν βεβήλοις ἀποκείμεναι γραφαί*,[10] and it is no accident that recent reappraisals of this controversial and ambiguous pattern argue for its reliability precisely through comparison with oriental 'historiography'.[11] The list of the *ἀρχαῖοι συγγραφεῖς* mentioned here by Dionysius is a notorious melting-pot in which

[9] Ong, *Orality and Literacy* [n. 2], 78.

[10] D.H. *Thuc.* 5. 13–15 Aujac. For the problems of interpretation of this famous chapter see W. K. Pritchett, *Dionysius of Halicarnassus* On Thukydides (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1975), 50–7; *Dénys d'Halicarnasse: Opuscules rhétoriques*, iv, ed. G. Aujac (Paris, 1991), 147; also Fornara, *The Nature of History* [n. 1], 16–23; Detienne, *L'Invention de la mythologie* [n. 2], 145–51; G. Maddoli, 'Testo scritto e non scritto', in G. Cambiano, L. Canfora, and D. Lanza (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica*, i/1 (Rome, 1992), 17–45 at 38–40; G. Camassa, 'Gli "elementi della tradizione": Il caso dell'Athenaion Politeia', in G. Maddoli (ed.), *L'Athenaion Politeia di Aristotele 1891–1991: Per un bilancio di cento anni di studi* (Naples, 1994), 149–65 at 153–4.

[11] S. Gozzoli, 'Una teoria antica sull'origine della storiografia greca', *SCO* 19–

'local' historians and 'genealogists' like Hecataeus and Acusilaus are thrown together.[12] Ignoring other problems posed by this list,[13] we shall focus here on the true initiators of historiography, i.e. the 'genealogists'.

We have no difficulty accepting that epichoric *μνῆμαι* provided the material for the first historical works (and we shall see instances of this in the 'genealogists'). However, with the 'sacred' and 'profane' *γραφαί*, whatever Dionysius meant by this word, it is quite a different matter. If these written records are taken to be 'pre-literary chronicles' (Jacoby) or 'public chronicles of political events', then the state of our sources has not changed since Jacoby: 'a class of inscription still remains unrepresented in any area: namely, public chronicles of political events. No archaic example, even of the briefest type, has yet been found in any state, on either stelai or walls, or on bronze plaques', as Lilian H. Jeffery clearly stated in 1969.[14] More recent research on the public 'archives' supports her

20 (1970–1), 158–211; L. Troiani, 'Contributo alla problematica dei rapporti fra storiografia greca e storiografia vicino-orientale', *Athenaeum*, 61 (1983), 427–38.

[12] The name of Pherecydes is here forgotten or omitted, but in *AR* 1. 13. 1 Dionysius lists him among the *ἀρχαῖοι συγγραφεῖς*. On this confusion see Jacoby, *FGrHist* i, Komm. 318, and *Atthis* [n. 1], 354.

[13] Dionysius' chronological arrangement of early historians is crucial for the interpretation of the evolution of Greek historiography between Hecataeus and Thucydides. Here Jacoby's thesis, which gave priority to 'panhellenic historiography' over local historiography (see Jacoby, 'Über die Entwicklung der griechischen Historiographie' [n. 1], 109 ff. = *Abhandlungen*, 48 ff.; *Atthis*, [n. 1], 58 ff. ; ch. III, esp. 178 ff.), has hardly been discussed at all for a long time: K. von Fritz, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung* (2 vols.; Berlin, 1967), ch. IV nn. 74–5; A. Momigliano, 'Storiografia su tradizione scritta e storiografia su tradizione orale', *Atti dell'Accademia delle Scienze di Torino*, 96 (1961–2), 186–97, Engl. trans. by J. Wardman as 'Historiography on Written Tradition and Historiography on Oral Tradition', in A. Momigliano, *Studies in Historiography* (London, 1966), 211–20; id., 'Tradition and the Classical Historian' [n. 7], 23 ff., but also id., 'Storiografia greca', *RSI* 87 (1975), 17–46, repr. in id., *Sesto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico* (Rome, 1980), 33–67 at 18–19; R. Drews, *The Greek Accounts of Eastern History* (Cambridge, Mass., 1973), 37 ff. ; M. I. Finley, *Ancient History: Evidence and Models* (London, 1985), ch. 2; O. Murray, 'Herodotus and Oral History', in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg and A. Kuhrt (eds.), *Achaemenid History*, ii. *The Greek Sources* (Leiden, 1987), 93–115 (reprinted in the present volume). However, Jacoby's position is now being questioned: see particularly R. L. Fowler, 'Herodotus and his Contemporaries', *JHS* 116 (1996), 62–87, but note already S. Mazzarino, *Il pensiero storico classico*, i, 2nd edn. (Bari, 1966), ch. II; G. Nenci, 'La storiografia preerodotea', *CS* 6 (1967), 1–22; M. Moggi, 'Autori greci di Persikà: Dionisio di Mileto', *ASNP* 3/2 (1972), 433–68, and id., 'Autori greci di Persikà, II: Carone di Lampsaco', *ASNP* 3/7 (1977), 1–26.

[14] See L. H. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece* (Oxford, 1969), 59,

statement.[15] If, on the other hand, one takes *γραφαί* more generally, as being 'records' of whatever kind, then it must be noted that we know examples of archaic records, such as the lists of officials dating from the sixth century collected in Jeffery's *Local Scripts*.[16] In spite of Jacoby's negative judgement on the historiographical value of such documents, and although '[their] total is meagre', one can imagine their utility for the chronological needs of writers of local histories or chronographers such as Hellanicus or Hippias. On the other hand, what utility could a *genealogist* find in a bare list of names—for such are the surviving ones—which recorded *historical* figures not earlier than the eighth century, when his own subject-matter—with one or two exceptions, as we shall see—remained confined within the mythical age? On the whole, the burden of the proof falls on those who maintain that documentary or any other written public records from the sixth century may have had a bearing on genealogical historiography.

However, one wonders whether Flavius Josephus (*Ap.* 1. 20) does not fit the features of early Greek historiography better than Dionysius' documentary perspective. For Josephus, the cause of the 'disagreement' (*διαφωνία*) and the 'errors' (*πλάνη*) in Greek historiography lay precisely in the indifference of the Greeks to the keeping of 'public records' (*δημόσιαι ἀναγραφαί*) of events.

To sum up, the introduction and use of writing—seen as a development from an entirely oral culture to a halfway oral and halfway script one or as medium for the composition of written records—is no *sufficient* explanation for the birth of Greek historiography: it is worth bearing in mind that Greek historiography began as ethnographic and genealogical research (*ἱστορίη*). On the other hand, writing was the *necessary* tool to bring about the change of mentality from which (genealogical) historiography originated.

unchanged in the revised edition by A. W. Johnston (Oxford, 1990); see also p. 430 in Johnston's Supplement.

[15] E. Posner, *Archives in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, Mass, 1972), ch. 3; S. Georgoudi, 'Manières d'archivage et archives de cités', in M. Detienne (ed.), *Les Savoirs de l'écriture en Grèce ancienne* (Lille, 1988), 221–47; L. Boffo, 'Ancora una volta sugli "archivi" nel mondo greco: Conservazione e "pubblicazione" epigrafica', *Athenaeum*, 83 (1995), 91–130; M. Faraguna, 'Registrazioni catastali nel mondo greco: Il caso di Atene', *Athenaeum*, 85 (1997), 7–33; for further bibliography see M. L. Lazzarini, 'La scrittura nella città: iscrizioni, archivi e alfabetizzazione', in S. Settis (ed.), *I Greci: Storia, cultura, arte e società*, ii/2 (Turin, 1997), 740 ff.

[16] Jeffery, *Local Scripts* [n. 14], 58 ff. See also for Athens *IG* i³. 1031, 1033.

2. *The Hesiodic Catalogue*

In order to appreciate the *innovation* represented by the invention of historiography within the general framework of the transition from oral to script culture in Greece, the basic test case is the change in the structure of genealogy between the Hesiodic *Catalogue* and the 'genealogists' of the late sixth and early fifth centuries. 'No history without myth': this formula is an apt description of the first Greek historians' activity, which consisted basically in a rearrangement of mythic materials. From the viewpoint of genealogies, the mythic forebear was represented by the Hesiodic *Catalogue*. It is true that early genealogists had other mythological sources at their disposal, such as local epics (the *Corinthiaca* by Eumelus of Corinth, the *Naupactia*, Eugammon's *Cyrene*, etc.), narrative elegies about κτίσεις (Mimnermus' *Smyrneis* and *Nanno*, Xenophanes' *Foundation of Colophon*, Semonides' *Early History of the Samians*), and iambic or elegiac poetry sung in symposia about more or less recent events, such as Tyrtaeus' *Eunomia* or some allusions to Parian history in Archilochus.[17] However, the undisputedly panhellenic scope of the early genealogical works finds its counterpart essentially in the Hesiodic *Catalogue*, which aims at sketching the map of the Greek lineages from the north to Attica and the Peloponnese and beyond. Clement of Alexandria's charge of plagiarism against Acusilaus for 'having translated Hesiod in prose' and Josephus' statement that Acusilaus corrected Hesiod in many points bear witness to the popularity of Hesiodic genealogical poetry among the earliest historians.[18]

According to Martin West,[19] the *Catalogue* should be the result of succeeding aggregations of heroic dynasties, starting from the

[17] On this topic in particular see E. L. Bowie, 'Early Greek Elegy, Symposium and Public Festival', *JHS* 106 (1986), 13–35, and in this volume; C. Dougherty, 'Archaic Greek Foundation Poetry: Questions of Genre and Occasion', *JHS* 114 (1994), 35–46; W. Rösler, 'Mnemosyne in the Symposium', in O. Murray (ed.), *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposion* (Oxford, 1990), 230–37; for Archilochus cf. frr. 93a–b, 94, 98–9 W.

[18] Clem. Alex. Strom. 6. 2. 26 = *FGrHist* 2 T 5; Jos. *Ap.* 1 6 = *FGrHist* 2 T 6; see also Strabo 1. 2. 6; L. Bertelli, '"C'era una volta un mito . . .": Alle origini della storiografia greca', in *De tuo tibi: Omaggio degli allievi a Italo Lana* (Bologna, 1996), 49–85 at 55 ff.

[19] M. L. West, *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Its Nature, Structure, and Origins* (Oxford, 1985); but also J. Schwartz, *Pseudo-Hesiodea* (Leiden, 1960), 265 ff.

eighth century and reaching its final (?) version in the first decades of the sixth, possibly in Attica. The work drafts a genealogical map which begins with the north-west (Deucalionids) and extends to the south (Peloponnese) and east (Attica as far as Euboea). However, it cannot be maintained that it has a deliberate spatial organization: southern and eastern supplements have simply been later integrated into an original genealogical core from northern and central Greece. The slight relevance attached to Attic genealogies along with some superficial mythical 'Atticisms' might point to the Attic section being an addition made by the final redactor.

The genealogies of the *Catalogue* combine a vertical structure, from the founder to the direct offspring, with a horizontal one, through marriage kinships, but they are not interconnected by synchronisms or successions:[20] the structure substantially follows that of the *Theogony*, and there is no attempt to establish chronological links between one lineage and the other. The chronological framework remains bound to the mythical vision of an age in which 'men and gods lived together';[21] the generations of the heroes are indeed the progenies sprung from unions of gods and men, ending in the final catastrophe of the Trojan war (fr. 204 MW)—the *Heldendämmerung*, as West aptly calls it—which concludes the heroic age in compliance with Zeus' decision, radical and little motivated, but already topical in the archaic age, as shown by the reappearance of the motif in the *Cypria* (fr. 1 Davies).

Time in the *Catalogue* is no more than an extension of the genealogical concept of time of the myth of ages in the *Works and Days*.[22] It has no link with the present, although reflections of current events are of course present in the organization of the matter: for instance, the entry on Cyrene (fr. 215 MW) obviously mirrors the foundation of the colony around 630, and it is not difficult to see,

[20] About the failure of the Catalogue to synchronize different genealogies see West, *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women* [n. 19], 122, and id., 'The Hesiodic Catalogue: New Light on Apollo's Love-life', *ZPE* 61 (1985), 1–7 at 3; note West's explanation for these patent incongruities: 'He [sc. the *Catalogue*'s author] could hardly have taken stock of the problem unless he had drawn up a comprehensive table of synchronisms, which would have been to anticipate the scientific approach of the late fifth century' (*The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women*, 122). West's description of the 'scientific approach of the late fifth century' would indeed be appropriate for Hecataeus' method, as we shall see later.

[21] See Catalogue fr. 1. 6–7 MW.

[22] West, *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women* [n. 19], 3; the point is strengthened by the possible repetition of *Catalogue* 204, 176–8 from *Works and Days* 90–2.

in the extensive narration of the competition among Helen's suitors (frr. 200–4 MW), a reflection of another famous wedding, that of Agariste at Sicyon. Even fr. 190a MW, recently discovered by Luppe,[23] does not seem to deviate significantly from the mythical time structure; it rather shows the tendency towards the 'parochial mythology' (West) typical of the Attic section, which might, however, be seen as a sign of a new sensibility to problems of local eponymy arising in the last phase of the *Catalogue*'s composition.

All this does not mean that Hesiod could not reflect on the past and link it with the present: but the connection is perceived only in autobiographic memory. Hesiod can take his father's trip from Aeolic Kyme as an example of *ναυτιλίη* in search of gain (*κέρδος*) (*Works and Days* 633–40) or his own crossing to Euboea for the *ἄεθλα* of Alcidamas as a model experience of navigation (*Works and Days* 650–5): here his use of the mythical gathering of the Achaean fleet in Aulis as a 'historical' antecedent to his own stay in that city is remarkable.

As for the reasons for the composition of a work like the *Catalogue*, we may confidently exclude 'dynastic' concerns underpinning the claims of any particular family: the genealogical representation of the *Catalogue* rather reflects the situation of a loose society with no centre dominating the others, as Greek society between the eighth and seventh centuries must have been. We may suppose that, at the beginning, only local genealogies existed, which exalted some noble lineages, and that only later, under the influence of Homeric epic and the aspiration of the local lineages to link themselves to it, the necessity was felt to organize such genealogies in broader complexes of interlinked descents, thereby overstepping the borders of the original region. If the Homeric epic could represent the charter of Greek ethnic unity after the 'long sleep' of the geometric age, the *Catalogue* could serve as a charter of regional identity for the various lineages, interwoven in a fabric which encompassed the whole of Greece and taking into account during its development the expansion of the Greeks overseas. It is not by chance that the main aggregation centres of the various lineages follow, to some extent, the colonial expansion in the eighth–seventh centuries: from

[23] W. Luppe, 'Epikureische Mythenkritik bei Philodem: Götterliebschaften in Pherec. 243 II und III', *Cronache ercolanesi*, 14 (1984), 109–24: the fragment speaks of Euboea and confronts problems of eponymy, like fr. 225 MW (Melite), where it is not necessary to think of a post-Clisthenic insertion; see also West, 'The Hesiodic Catalogue' [n. 20].

the original Deucalionids, representing, with various appendices, northern and central Greece and the Peloponnese, through the progeny of the Inachids, the genealogical net stretches to the east (Euboea) and establishes relations with the foreign lands (Scythians, Lybia, Egypt, Phoenicia) with which the Greeks were binding commercial and colonial contacts during these same two centuries. Phineus' flight (frr. 150–7 MW) traces the half-real, half-imaginary map of the *Catalogue*, which extends from the west (Aetna, Ortygia, Cephallenia) to the east (Scythians), to the south (Aethiopians, Pygmies, and fabulous populations), and to the north (Eridanus, Hyperboreans).

The Attic supplement introduces new principles of assembling, which are made conspicuous with the absorption of the Megarean Nisus into Pandion's genealogy (frr. 43a, 70 MW), and of Sicyon, eponym of Sicyon, who becomes a son of Erechtheus (fr. 224 MW), or by the wedding of Xuthus and Creusa, daughter of Erechtheus (frr. 10a, 20 MW). At this stage we are confronted with a propagandistic use of the mythical tradition for the defence of local interests, such as the possession of Nisa, conquered by Pisistratus shortly before 560, or friendly relations with Sicyon, fostered by the wedding of Agariste with the Alcmaeonid Megacles, or Athens' claim to be the mother country of Ionia, a theme to be found already in Solon (fr. 4a W). It may be argued that the final Attic redaction mirrors aims and interests that are quite different from the simple geographic expansion of genealogical links apparent in the older genealogies: we are already closer to a deliberate use of genealogy for immediate goals, although of course the rules of the genre, forbidding explicit allusions to the present apart from exceptional cases, are respected. In other words, the organization of traditional matter in this final phase is already similar to the kind of aims which first appear explicitly in Hecataeus.

3. *Hecataeus' 'Innovation'*

The current image of Hecataeus fluctuates between, on the one hand, an optimistic and more traditional one, considering him to be the 'inventor' of genealogical chronology and of the rational explanation of mythical traditions, basic instruments for historical

discourse,[24] and, on the other, a more recent one, which denies to him the role of the 'father of history' and reduces him to a mere heir to the Hesiodic tradition, with some personal critical insights but without any improvement in chronological knowledge.[25] According to this second interpretation, apart from some moderately critical rearrangement of the mythical heritage, Hecataeus' innovation would consist only in the changing of the medium, from poetry to prose. But the transition from the one communication form to the other was neither as natural nor as unproblematic as this reconstruction would claim: it was no bare translation. Furthermore, it may be argued that Hecataeus shows signs of innovation in comparison with the 'formalized social past' of the Hesiodic tradition.[26] However, these signs need to be carefully scrutinized, in order to assess their relevance and their objectives.

Hecataeus exhibits all the characteristics of Assmann's 'agonistic intertextuality' stage, based upon a triangular relationship—author, predecessor, topic—and on the threefold reference to the previous

[24] See E. Meyer, *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte*, i (Halle, 1892), 169 ff., and id., *Geschichte des Alterthums*, ii (Stuttagrt, 1893), 7 ff.; F. Jacoby, 'Hekataios von Milet', *RE* vii/2 (1912), 2667–750 at 2667 ff.; G. De Sanctis, 'Intorno al razionalismo di Ecateo', *RFIC* 61 (1933), 1–15; W. A. Heidel, 'Hecataeus and the Egyptian Priests in Herodotus, Book II', *American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Memoirs* 18/2 (1935), 53–134; K. v. Fritz, 'Herodotus and the Growth of Greek Historiography', *TAPhA* 67 (1936), 315–40 at 317, but more dubious in *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung* [n. 13], i. 67 ff., ii. 49 ff.; D. W. Prakken, 'Herodotus and the Spartan King Lists', *TAPhA* 71 (1940), 460–72 at 461, and id., *Studies in Greek Genealogical Chronology* (Lancaster, Pa., 1943), 3; Fornara, *The Nature of History* [n. 1], 6–7, ascribes to Hecataeus 'explicitly or implicitly' 'a boundary line between heroic and historical times', but without any argumentation.

[25] L. Pearson, The *Early Ionian Historians* (Oxford, 1939), 105 ff. ; F. Mitchel, 'Herodotus' Use of Genealogical Chronology', *Phoenix*, 10 (1956), 48–69 (a thorough demolition of Meyer's hypothesis); M. Miller, 'Herodotus as Chronographer', *Klio*, 46 (1965), 109–28; W. Burkert, 'Lydia between East and West or How to Date the Trojan War: A Study in Herodotus', in J. B. Carter and S. P. Morris (eds.), *The Ages of Homer: A Tribute to Emily T. Vermeule* (Austin, 1995), 139–48; A. Möller, 'Der Stammbaum der Philaiden: Über Funktionen der Genealogie bei den Griechen', in M. Flashar, H.-J. Gehrke, and E. Heinrich (eds.), *Retrospektive: Konzepte von Vergangenheit in der griechisch-römischen Antike* (Munich, 1996), 17–35; F. Lasserre, 'L'historiographie grecque à l'époque archaïque', *QS* 4 (1976), 113–42, grants to Hecataeus the 'véritable nouveauté' of the 'historicisation de l'époque héroïque par une chronologie rationelle' (117), but at the same time sees him more as the 'continuateur de la tradition épique' than 'le précurseur d'Hérodote' (118), a rather contradictory view, which does not give due weight to Hecataeus' 'véritable nouveauté'.

[26] See E. Hobsbawm, *On History* (London, 1997), ch. 2 (the whole book is fundamental for the concept of 'innovation' in the historical field).

texts, the object, and the criteria through which the truthfulness of a text is assessed. The object or 'topical field' of his ἱστορίη was bound to be genealogy, since there was no other possible narration of the past: the matter had already been exhausted by the *Heldensage*, and 'ex parte materiae' undoubtedly Hecataeus looks like an heir of Hesiodic genealogical tradition.

The decision to write the *Genealogies*—as well as the *Periegesis*, we may suppose—in prose is the most superficial, but not the least relevant, aspect of Hecataeus' innovation. The conventional explanation for this innovation is that Hecataeus, continuing the scientific (geographical) interests of the 'Milesian school', also adopted its language and scientific style.[27] This explanation, however, takes it for granted that the Milesian cosmologists really used prose to expound their theories, and does not take into consideration that Hecataeus also knew the alternative model of Xenophanes, who, using hexameters, elegies, and iambs, was not only able to argue against Homeric and Hesiodic tradition, but even to describe scientific phenomena like the fossils at Syracuse, Paros, and Malta (21 A 33 DK).

In fact, the very existence of a Milesian 'scientific prose' before Hecataeus—conceived of as the adequate linguistic instrument for the needs of Milesian 'new rationality'—is a usually unquestioned assumption which would really need better arguments before being taken as demonstrated.[28] On the other hand, Hecataeus' choice

[27] See Jacoby, 'Hekataios von Milet' [n. 24], 2667, whose opinion has become the accepted orthodoxy; cf. v. Fritz, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung* [n. 13], 48 ff. On Hecataeus as an improver of Anaximander's map, see *FGrHist* 1 F 11b; 12a, b.

[28] In the doxographic tradition (*Suda* s.v. Φερεκύδης) the first prose work is credited to Pherecydes of Syros (*fl.* 544/541 BC), on whom see M. P. West, *Early Greek Philosophy and the Orient* (Oxford, 1971), chs. 1–2, but also F. Jacoby, 'The First Athenian Prose Writer', *Mnemosyne*[3], 13 (1947), 13–64 at 20 ff.; H. Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums*, 2nd edn. (Munich, 1962), 281–2. No writings of Thales were known other than late forgeries (11 A 1 DK, 1. 67. 16–17.), while a 'book' of Anaximander's is mentioned in which Anaximander briefly expounded his theories (12 A 7 DK), a work which Apollodorus of Athens allegedly consulted (12 A 1. 17 ff. DK). The well-known 'fragment' B 1, regardless of its original length, shows a prose which Simplicius (Theophrastus) found 'poetic' (12 A 9. 8). On prose 'philosophical treatise' and its function see West, *Early Greek Philosophy and the Orient*, 4–5; M. Untersteiner, *Problemi di filologia filosofica* (Milan, 1980), 15 ff. Havelock's hypothesis (*The Muse Learns to Write* [n. 2], 91) of a poetic original of Anaximander 12 B 1 DK is not sufficiently well founded. In any case, provided that it ever existed, the 'philosophical treatise' must have been a 'record of spoken words' (West) with a restricted circulation. On the Milesians see W. K. C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy*, i. *The Earlier Presocratics and*

of prose does not really need the Milesian cosmologists as forerunners, because Hecataeus may have known Pherecydes of Syrus' work, most certainly in prose, which is close to his own genealogical argument. More important still, the craft of prose writing could avail itself of at least a century and a half of experience, which is documented by law inscriptions. The emergence of the ability to organize a discourse in the spoken language is obvious if we compare the still simple law of Dreros, about 650 BC, and the great *rhētra* of Chios, more or less a century later.[29]

All this, however, only shows the existence of the instrument, but does not explain Hecataeus' choice. Using prose for a topic like genealogy, which had a long tradition as a poetry genre, cannot be simply interpreted as a bare compliance with the 'Milesian school'. It cannot be maintained, as Strabo (1. 2. 6=T16) did, that Hecataeus simply 'translated in prose' the Homeric and Hesiodic heritage. The use of prose presupposes a different audience, certainly a smaller one, and one ready to accept criticism of genealogical tradition. Furthermore, although it was not necessary to use prose in order to criticize tradition, as Xenophanes had shown, the λέξις εἰρομένη[30] chosen by Hecataeus, with its subordinate constructions allowing argument as well as description,[31] was a far more effective instrument, not only to get rid of the formulaic structure of genealogical poetry, but also to scrutinize it polemically and put forward arguments to refute it. It is hard to imagine Hecataeus writing down his criticism of Hesiod in hexameters! I think that the choice of using prose may, to some extent, be explained in terms of acceptation of the Milesian model of scientific discourse, but it depends still more on Hecataeus' critical attitude towards tradition: this attitude is the next item we have to examine.

the Pythagoreans (Cambridge, 1962), 45 ff., and G. S. Kirk, J. E. Raven, and M. Schofield, *The Presocratic Philosophers: A Critical History with a Selection of Texts*, 2nd edn. (Cambridge and London, 1983), 76 ff.

[29] A similar argument regarding Pherecydes' prose is to be found in Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie* [n. 28], 282. On the date of the two inscriptions see now H. v. Effenterre and F. Ruzé, *Nomima: Recueil d'inscriptions politiques et juridiques de l'archaïsme grec*, i (Rome, 1994), nn. 62, 81.

[30] On this see again H. Fränkel, *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens*, 2nd edn. (Munich, 1960), 62 ff.

[31] e.g. *FGrHist* 1 F 27b (in the Addenda) and F 30.

3.1. *Naming the sources and establishing a truth standard*

The well-known sentence at the beginning of Hecataeus' *Genealogies* is a deliberate and well-balanced declaration of independence from tradition: while mentioning it by name, Hecataeus points to its limits and opposes to it his own personal perspective as author. What may be indirectly deduced from the utterances of the Milesian philosophers—the abandonment of the 'god apparatus' in explaining the phenomena, the search for a general and rational cause—takes in Hecataeus' proem the explicit form of a programmatic statement, in which the object and method of the enquiry are clearly indicated:

Ἑκαταῖος Μιλήσιος ὧδε μυθεῖται· τάδε γράφω, ὥς μοι δοκεῖ ἀληθέα εἶναι· οἱ γὰρ Ἑλλήνων λόγοι πολλοί τε καὶ γελοῖοι, ὡς ἐμοὶ φαίνονται, εἰσίν. (F 1)

Hecataeus the Milesian speaks as follows: I write down these things as they seem to me to be true, for the tales of the Greeks are many and ridiculous, as they seem to me.

These few words raise a series of problems and need to be explained by analysing the individual elements of the utterance. The shift from the third to the first person, which some scholars found paradoxical,[32] has been recently and astutely interpreted by Aldo Corcella as a formula taken from the Near Eastern style of introducing regal messages: 'King *X* saith so', followed by the text uttered in the first person.[33] Given Hecataeus' undoubted acquaintance with things Persian, Corcella is probably right. However, it is necessary to underline that Hecataeus does more than barely adopt the formula. Instead of using the normal *λέγει*, 'he says', as for instance Alcmaeon does in the proem of his *Περὶ φύσεως* (24 B 1 DK), Hecataeus reverts to the form *ὧδε μυθεῖται*, whose *only* precedent is the Homeric *ὧδε δὲ μυθέομαι*, which appears *only once* in an agonistic context.[34] Such a rare and precious Homeric reminiscence must be deliberate, and is as such the best introduction to the next epic reference in Hecataeus' text.

Following Jacoby's footsteps, the 'forebear' of Hecataeus' state-

[32] C. Calame, *Le Récit en Grèce ancienne: Énonciations et représentations de poètes* (Paris, 1986), 81.

[33] A. Corcella, '"Ecateo di Mileto così dice"', *QS* 43 (1996), 295–301. J. Svenbro, *Phrasikleia: Anthropologie de la lecture en Grèce ancienne* (Paris, 1988), 166, sees dedicatory inscriptions as the model of this statement.

[34] *Il.* 7. 76: Hector announces the terms of the challenge to Trojans and Greeks.

ment on the problem of truth is usually seen in Hesiod's famous announcement of the Muses (*Theogony* 26–8).[35] Although a reminiscence is possible, the meanings of the two statements are different. It is generally admitted that *Theogony* 27 (*ἴδμεν ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα*), with its precise allusion to *Od.* 19. 203, should be taken as a criticism of Homeric epic, which did not always conform to the truth.[36] Hesiod's truthfulness is guaranteed, on the one hand, by the inspiration of the Muses, who are able, 'if they wish' (*εὖτ' ἐθέλωμεν*), to 'utter the truth' (*ἀληθέα γηρύσασθαι*), and on the other by the topic, the 'progeny of the everlasting blessed'. In other words, for Hesiod, the divine genealogist, it is the 'objectivity' of oral tradition, symbolized by the Muses, which forms the inevitable touchstone of truth. On the contrary, for Hecataeus there is no external authority vouching for the truthfulness of his utterance; rather, the 'tales of the Greeks' (*οἱ Ἑλλήνων λόγοι*)[37] are absolutely unreliable, being 'many' (*πολλοί*) and 'ludicrous' (*γελοῖοι*)—the personal judgement *of the author* thereby being the only truth standard. The accent on the relation between opinion (*δοκεῖ*) and truth (*ἀληθέα*) may reflect Xenophanes' 'conjectural knowledge'.[38] Hecataeus' criticism is aimed at *the whole* of Greek mythic tradition.

[35] See Jacoby, 'Hekataios von Milet' [n. 24], 2738 (also *FGrHist* 1 F 1, Komm. 319); also Pearson, *The Early Ionian Historians* [n. 25], 97–8; Calame, *Le Récit* [n. 32], 81

[36] See H. Neitzel, 'Hesiod und die lügenden Musen: Zur Interpretation von Theogonie 27 f.', *Hermes*, 108 (1980), 387–401; G. Arrighetti, 'Esiodo e le Muse: il dono della verità e la conquista della parola', *Athenaeum*, 80 (1992), 45–63.

[37] Drews, *The Greek Accounts of Eastern History* [n. 13], 17 and 152 n. 62, following Diels's suggestion (H. Diels, 'Herodot und Hekataios', *Hermes*, 22 (1887), 411–44 at 436), thinks that 'Hecataeus corrected some of the foolish stories of the Greeks by citing what he claimed to have discovered in the East.' As a matter of fact, Hecataeus' corrections show no traces of non-Greek 'sources', but might at the most come from 'local' sources (Jacoby's *ἐπιχώριοι*: Jacoby, 'Hekataios von Milet', [n. 24], 2740). The only hint of 'phoenikische Gewährsmänner' in the *Genealogies* pertains to the linguistic problem of the name of Danae in F 21. Nagy's hypothesis (G. Nagy, 'Herodotus the Logios', *Arethusa*, 20 (1990), 175–84), identifying the Greeks' *λόγοι* with 'local tales', to which Hecataeus would oppose the 'truth' of his own 'panhellenic' stories, is groundless: the evidence of the fragments shows that Hecataeus produced his alternative versions either by providing conjectures of his own or by drawing on local traditions.

[38] See J. Svenbro, *La Parole et le marbre: Aux origines de la poétique grecque* (Lund, 1976), 94–5; on the relationship between Hecataeus and Xenophanes in general W. Heidel, 'Hecataeus and Xenophanes', *AJPh* 64 (1943), 257–77, is still useful. Detienne, *L'Invention de la mythologie* [n. 2], 140–1, suggests a connection between Hecataeus' 'conjectural' knowledge and the opinion in political decision-making. This positive judgement on *δόξα* might explain the impossible notice which makes of Hecataeus a pupil of Protagoras (*FGrHist* 1 T 1).

Of his predecessors, he explicitly criticized Hesiod by name, and most of the corrections aim at the Hesiodic *Catalogue*, but rectifications of Homer are not lacking either.[39] To sum up, if Hecataeus may have received the hint of a critical attitude towards tradition from Hesiod's *Theogony*, he took it a step further, involving Hesiodic tradition itself in a sort of second-grade criticism.

The reason for Hecataeus' negative judgement of the λόγοι of the Greeks—that they are 'many' and 'ludicrous'—takes up two features of mythic narrative which pertain to its subject-matter and to the way of setting it forth. A typical mode of archaic narration, of which Hesiod gives plenty of examples, consists in the *Umkreisen* about the narration, i.e. the progressive agglomeration of further details on and about the same topic.[40] The best-known examples are the myth of Prometheus and Pandora and the myth of ages in the *Works and Days*, where the second narration simply 'integrates' (ἐκκορυφώσω) the first, the poet refraining from stating which version he prefers.[41] According to Rowe, this use of 'multiple approaches', merely listing different versions of a tale paratactically without making a choice, rather than 'pre-logical', deserves to be defined as 'un-scientific', as opposed to the early philosophers' search for the 'best explanation' through a process of criticism and comparison with other conceivable explanations, or with traditional ones, a process which forced them 'to consider the grounds for their ideas, the evidence and arguments in their favour as well as the weak points in their opponents' theories'.[42] This description perfectly suits Hecataeus' goal in criticizing the

[39] See *FGrHist* 1 F 19 (cf. Hes. fr. 127 MW), which shows that, for Hecataeus, Hesiod was the author of the *Catalogue*. More corrections to Hesiod: F 13 (cf. Hes. fr. 9 MW); F 18 (cf. Hes. fr. 241 MW); F 26 (cf. Hes. *Th*. 290 ff.); to Homer: F 25 (cf. *Il*. 11. 670 ff.); F 27 (cf. *Il*. 8. 367–8; *Od*. 9. 623).

[40] See Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie* [n. 28], 116 (Hesiod); G. E. R. Lloyd, *Polarity and Analogy: Two Types of Argumentation in Early Greek Thought* (Cambridge and London, 1966), 202 (Homer); cf. the clear presentation of the theory and its application to Hesiod in C. J. Rowe, '"Archaic Thought" in Hesiod', *JHS* 103 (1983), 124–35.

[41] On the heavily debated meaning of this expression in *Works and Days* 106, cf. *Hesiod:* Works and Days, ed. M. L. West (Oxford, 1978), 178; Rowe, '"Archaic Thought" in Hesiod' [n. 40], 132–3; Rosenmeyer's hypothesis (T. Rosenmeyer, 'Hesiod and Historiography', *Hermes*, 85 (1975), 257–85) on the 'historicity' of the myth of ages, as opposed to the myth of Prometheus, is unacceptable.

[42] Rowe, '"Archaic Thought" in Hesiod' [n. 40], 133. The description of the early historians' method is quoted from G. E. R. Lloyd, *Early Greek Science: Thales to Aristotle* (London, 1970), 12.

multiplicity of mythic traditions. Far from pleading for a unified tradition as Josephus does (*Ap.* 12), Hecataeus simply required that the *narration* of an event be coherent, and aimed at this coherence by criticizing and selecting the most *probable* of different versions.[43]

Hecataeus' concept of probability can be deduced from his complaint that traditional λόγοι were ludicrous, and from his assumption of individual opinion, δόξα, as a standard of truth. Combining these two points, we have to admit that Hecataeus saw the ludicrousness of traditional tales in their implausibility in relation to common experience. In Thucydidean terms, Hecataeus did not reject myth, but rather the μυθώδες, the excess of the marvellous. Hecataeus' principle of likelihood stirs the controversy between the authorized use of myth as historical source and the extreme mistrust towards the μυθώδες that characterizes in various forms the peculiar marriage of myth and history in Greek historiography from Herodotus to Pausanias.[44]

Hecataeus' storytelling is no more a *registration* of oral (or written) tradition, but an *interpretation* which follows rules established by the storyteller himself. The narrative, as a product of the combination of individual δόξα with the selection of sources, embodies a 'regime of critical intelligence'[45] for which writing is the most appropriate instrument. The unusual τάδε γράφω, 'I *write* these things', is no bare variation of the more usual τάδε λέγω, 'I *say* these things',[46] and expresses Hecataeus' consciousness of the difference

[43] According to G. Nenci, 'Ecateo di Mileto e la questione del suo razionalismo', *RAL*[8] 6 (1951), 51–8, Hecataeus rather tended to ascertain a *single* version of every myth, which would not amount to the same thing. Nagy's interpretation (*Pindar's Homer* (Baltimore and London, 1990), 67), which extracts the meaning of ἀλήθεια from the opposition local–panhellenic, where 'true' should be the myth 'acceptable to all Hellenes', is also unacceptable: Nagy seems to overlook the fact that in Hecataeus' proem ἀλήθεια refers to the author's individual opinion (δοκεῖ) and not to the Greeks' judgement.

[44] See P. Veyne, *Les Grecs ont-ils cru à leur mythes?* (Paris, 1984); C. Calame, *Mythes et histoire dans l'antiquité grecque* (Lausanne, 1996); for further bibliography see Bertelli, '"C'era una volta un mito" . . .' [n. 18].

[45] M. Detienne, 'L'écriture et ses nouveaux objects intellectuels en Grèce', in Detienne (ed.), *Les Savoirs de l'écriture* [n. 15], 11–28 at 21.

[46] Cf. Alcmaeon 24 B 1 DK; Democritus (?) 68 B 299 DK; cf. Diogenes Apol. 64 B 1 DK; Ion 36 B 1 DK. The opposition between μυθεῖται and γράφω proposed by Detienne, *L'Invention de la mythologie* [n. 2], 137 ff., is unacceptable (cf. also Hartog, 'Écriture, généalogies, archives, histoire' [n. 2], 182, and L. Porciani, 'Oralità, scrittura, storiografia', in A. Alessandrì (ed.), *Ἱστορίη: Studi offerti dagli allievi a Giuseppe Nenci in occasione del suo settantesimo compleanno* (Bari, 1994), 377–97 at 383): the first verb simply 'announces' the message which follows; the second one

between his own written redaction and the '*λόγοι* of the Greeks', which are treated like 'sources' that may be criticized freely. This critical approach to tradition can only be operated through the medium of writing, which makes it possible to compare different versions of the same tale and imposes a coherence upon them which does not stem from the authority of tradition itself but rather from an external principle. This principle belongs to the writer as 'producer of the tale' (*λογοποιός*).[47]

Hecataeus' emphasis on the act of writing has nothing to do with hesitation on his part between written and oral narrative. Building upon Corcella's 'regal message' analogy, we can say that Hecataeus knows well that his own 'written message', when read, or rather heard, by an audience in the author's absence, will not enjoy the status of direct authorial performance. Therefore he protects it from possible censure with his 'trade mark', vouching for personal scrutiny of traditional matter according to standards of likelihood. The text speaks on behalf of the author, and 'authenticity' is guaranteed by a technique which is not very different from the one used by late archaic potters or painters.[48]

3.2. *Hecataeus' 'rationalism'*

We now have to turn to the very functioning of Hecataeus' rule of likelihood, which means dealing with the question of his famed 'rationalism'.[49] From the fragments it is obvious that Hecataeus, where he could, or where he had a different version at hand, derived perhaps from his geographical researches, corrected the Hesiodic (or Homeric) tradition or in any case the vulgate. In the genealogy of the Deucalionids (F 15), he introduced an aetiology for the origin

refers to the 'composition' of the work. The interpretation of Maddoli, 'Testo scritto e non scritto' [n. 10], 40, is more correct.

[47] The term appears in Hdt. 2. 143; 5. 36, 125; on its meaning see Detienne, *L'Invention de la mythologie* [n. 2], 134–5; but cf. below, n. 77.

[48] Cf. on this problem in general Svenbro, *Phrasikleia* [n. 33].

[49] On which see Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums* [n. 24], ii. 758; Jacoby, 'Hekataios von Milet' [n. 24], 2738–9 ; A. Momigliano, 'Il razionalismo di Ecateo di Mileto', *A&R*, NS 12 (1931), 133–42, and id., 'Ecateo', in *Enciclopedia italiana*, xiii (Rome, 1932), 386; De Sanctis, 'Intorno al razionialismo di Ecateo' [n. 24]; Nenci, 'Ecateo di Mileto e la questione del suo razionalismo' [n. 43]; A. Gitti, 'Sul proemio delle "Genealogie" di Ecateo', *RAL*[8] 7 (1952), 389–98; R. Fertonani, 'Ecateo di Mileto e il suo razionalismo', *PdP* 7 (1952), 18–29; P. Tozzi, 'Studi su Ecateo di Mileto' II–IV, *Athenaeum*, 41 (1963), 318–26; 42 (1964), 101–10; 44 (1966), 41–76; v. Fritz, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung* [n. 13], i. 68 ff.

of the vine in Aetolia, which explains the family members' names by etymology. Orestheus, the son of Deucalion, had a bitch which gave birth to a vinestock. The vinestock was planted in the soil and produced a vine with many tendrils, and therefore Orestheus' son was called Phytios, 'the vinedresser'. His son was Oineus, 'the vintager', because originally vine was called *οἴνη*. Apart from deviating markedly from Hesiod's stemma,[50] Hecataeus does not find it strange that an animal might give birth to a plant. Those who are not content with granting him an unsophisticated readiness 'not to reject tales with supernatural elements'[51] tried to explain this story in connection with the theories of Ionian philosophy (Anaximander) on *generatio in utero heterogeneo*.[52] The source of this marvellous tale was certainly not the Hesiodic tradition, which attributed the invention of wine to Dionysus, whereas other traditions, although making Oineus the protagonist of the story, narrated the discovery in a different way.[53] It was probably Locrian and Aetolic toponymy, as Tozzi thinks,[54] which induced Hecataeus to accept in the *Genealogies* this version of the discovery of vine and to locate it here. In other words, this might be a local aetiological tale, presumably collected by Hecataeus during his geographical enquiries.

As a typical *λόγος εἰκώς* (probable statement) of Hecataeus', Pausanias (3. 25. 4 = F 27) mentioned the explanation of the 'Hades' dog' at Cape Tainaron, a snake equipped with deadly poison rather than the fabulous beast which Heracles took out of the nether world. Hecataeus' criticism possibly extended to the very existence of a gate of Hades in that place.[55] Anyway his interpretation, which lacks forerunners, possibly stemmed from a metaphorical understanding of the traditional (Homeric and Hesiodic) definition of 'Hades'

[50] In the *Catalogue* Orestheus does not belong to the Deucalionids, but turns out (frr. 11. 7; 12; 14. 3; 25. 14) to be a descendant of Aeolus via Portaon, and father of Tydeus (cf. *Il*. 14. 115 ff.), and is connected to Calydon, where he receives the vine as a gift from Dionysus (see ps.-Apoll. *Bibl*. 1. 64); Hecataeus' version of the story of Orestheus and the vine reappears in Pausanias (10. 38. 1) but located among the Ozolian Locrians (see Jacoby, 1 F 15, Komm. 322).

[51] As Momigliano, 'Il razionalismo di Ecateo' [n. 49], 134.

[52] See v. Fritz, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung* [n. 13], 72–3; cf. Fertonani, 'Ecateo di Mileto e suo razionalismo' [n. 49], 26–7; Tozzi, 'Studi su Ecateo di Mileto' [n. 49], IV: 63–4.

[53] See ps.-Apoll. *Bibl*. 1. 8; Hyg. *Fab*. 129; on the Dionysiac origin of the vine Hes. fr. 239 MW.

[54] Tozzi, 'Studi su Ecateo di Mileto' [n. 49], IV: 52.

[55] See Momigliano, 'Il razionalismo di Ecateo' [n. 49], 135, who extends the part pertaining to Hecataeus to Pausanias' introductory commentary. *Contra* Nenci, 'Ecateo di Mileto e la questione del suo razionalismo' [n. 43], 57.

dog'.[56] Instead of selecting from different versions, Hecataeus in this case gives a 'conjectural' interpretation—Pausanias emphasizes this, calling it a *λόγος εἰκώς*—based perhaps on linguistic arguments.[57]

Another episode of Heracles' deeds offers Hecataeus the opportunity for a blatant correction of Hesiodic myth: Geryon lived neither in the land of the Iberians nor in the fabulous island of Erytheia amidst the waves of the vast Ocean, but more prosaically in the territory of Ambracia and of the Amphilochians.[58] Here Hecataeus was quite probably once more drawing upon his geographical knowledge of homonymous places in order to make Heracles' deed more 'credible' and reduce it to a human dimension.[59]

A similar 'rationalistic' tendency to demythologize heroic tales is to be found in King Keyx's justification of his refusal to help the Heraclids, owing to his fear of Eurystheus' wrath (F 30). The mythical narration is replaced by a speech in which the king less than heroically admits his impotence and fear and invites the Heraclids to seek for protection elsewhere. The same trend is evident in F 19, where Hecataeus reduces Aegyptus' fifty sons that are mentioned by Hesiod to a more reasonable twenty, apparently with no further justification than likelihood.

[56] See Jacoby, F 27, Komm. 326; cf. G. Nenci, 'Eracle e Cerbero in Ecateo Milesio', *PdP* 41 (1955), 130–6.

[57] The (fragmentary) direct tradition of this passage confirms the presence of conjectural interpretation; see *PRIMI* no. 17, II. 28 ff. = 1 F 27b in the *Addenda* to *FGrHist* i (Leiden, 1957).

[58] Arrian *Anab.* 2. 16. 5 = F 26: Hecataeus corrected both Hesiod on the island of Erytheia in the Ocean (*Th.* 287 ff.) and the tradition concering the trip to Iberia (cf. Stes. fr. 7; S 7 Page). It must be borne in mind that *Periegesis* F 76 shows that here Hecataeus accepted the traditional version of Heracles' trip from Erytheia to Greece, for he had Heracles travelling through Sicilian Motye: according to Jacoby (1 F 26, Komm. 325), the 'revision' of the myth in the *Genealogies* is later than the version of the *Periegesis*. In fact it is also possible that Hecataeus, in the *Periegesis*, barely registered a local tradition, his own version of the myth being the one of the *Genealogies*: in this case the chronological point would lose its weight, all the more so since it is neither probable, as Jacoby maintains, nor demonstrable that Hecataeus lies behind the 'Greeks living in the Pontus' mentioned at Hdt. 4. 8. A trace of Hecataeus' location of the theft of the oxen is to be found in ps.-Scylax 26.

[59] So Tozzi, 'Studi su Ecateo di Mileto' [n. 49], IV: 52, 66. G. Huxley, 'A Poem of the Ainianes', *GRBS* 8 (1967), 88–92, puts forward an interesting hypothesis regarding Hecataeus' method of searching for alternative sources: his 'source' here would be the verses of a 'local' poem of the Aenians attested by ps.-Arist. *Mir. auscult.* 113, $843^{b}15$–$844^{a}5$. If this were the case, we would have proof that Jacoby's exclusion of the use of local sources (*FGrHist* 1 F 27, Komm. 326) cannot always be applied to Hecataeus.

'State reason' lies behind the explanation of another mythical tale that Herodotus (6. 137) takes from Hecataeus, without saying from which work,[60] so that Jacoby, although emphasising the *Volkssage* character of the story,[61] attributed it—without evident reason—to the *Periegesis* (F 127). Exactly because of its character, others attributed the story to the *Genealogies*.[62] In any case, it is in perfect accordance with the interpretative categories of the latter work:

There were certain Pelasgians whom the Athenians once drove out of Attica; whether they did it justly or unjustly I cannot say, since I only know what is reported concerning it, which is the following: Hecataeus, the son of Hegesander, says in his *logoi* that it was unjustly. The Athenians, according to him, had given to the Pelasgians a tract of land at the foot of Hymettus as payment for the wall with which the Pelasgians had surrounded the citadel. This land was barren, and little worth at that time; but the Pelasgians brought it into a good condition; whereupon the Athenians begrudged them the tract, and desired to recover it. And so, without any better excuse, they took arms and drove out the Pelasgians. But the Athenians maintain that they were justified in what they did. The Pelasgians, they say, while they lived at the foot of Hymettus, were wont to sally forth from that region and commit outrages on their children. For the Athenians used at that time to send their sons and daughters to draw water at the fountain called 'the Nine Springs', inasmuch as neither they nor the other Greeks had any household slaves in those days; and the maidens, whenever they came, were used rudely and insolently by the Pelasgians. Nor were they even content thus; but at the last they laid a plot, and were caught by the Athenians in the act of making an attempt upon their city. Then did the Athenians give a proof how much better men they were than the Pelasgians; for whereas they might justly have killed them all, having caught them in the very act of rebelling, they spared their lives, and only required that they should leave the country. Hereupon the Pelasgians quitted Attica, and settled in Lemnos and other places. Such are the accounts respectively of Hecataeus and the Athenians. (trans. Rawlinson)

Who is criticizing whom? Hecataeus' version makes sense only if taken as criticism of those who maintained that the Pelasgians had

[60] He does not do it in 2. 143 (= F 300) either.

[61] *FGrHist* 1 F 127, Komm. 343.

[62] As a matter of fact, G. Nenci, *Hecataei Milesii Fragmenta* (Florence, 1954), 30, edited it as fr. 17 of the *Genealogies*. For differences of opinion regarding the attribution of this fragment to the *Periegesis* see Pearson, *The Early Ionian Historians* [n. 25], 53, opting for Jacoby's solution, and Mazzarino, *Il pensiero storico classico* [n. 13], i. 80, 550 n. 103, agreeing with Nenci; see also pros and cons in v. Fritz, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung* [n. 13], ii. 47–8 n. 74.

been justly expelled. Therefore the other version, the Athenian one according to Herodotus,[63] must have already been in circulation when Hecataeus was writing his *Genealogies*.[64] This, incidentally, would make it impossible to assign the Athenian version to Pherecydes,[65] who certainly wrote his *Historiai* after Hecataeus.[66] On the other hand, the 'Athenian tradition' may well have taken shape earlier than Pherecydes, at the time of Miltiades' conquest of Pelasgian Lemnos (between 514 and 506), perhaps in a Philaid entourage,[67] as a mythological charter which justified the subjugation of the island as retaliation for the previous offence: Herodotus himself alludes to this motif (6. 136. 2). Hecataeus may well have known this version and reacted against it by retrojecting the Athenians' *hybris* to the mythical precedent. If that is the case, Hecataeus reconstructed the relations between Athenians and Pelasgians during the mythical age in the light of the recent occupation of Lemnos and the expulsion of the Pelasgians from the island. His 'sympathy' for the 'barbarians'[68] would then at the same time disclose a strange

[63] For Jacoby (*FGrHist* 1 F 127, Komm. 343) it would be the result of Herodotus' personal enquiring in Athens as to whether 'Hecataeus had narrated the story correctly'. For a possible Philaid origin of the Athenian version see K. Kinzl, *Miltiades-Forschungen* (Vienna, 1968), 130, 152, and E. Lanzillotta, 'Milziade nel Chersoneso e la conquista di Lemno', *MGR* 5 (1977), 65–94 at 83.

[64] Even Jacoby concedes that the Athenian version must go back to *c.*512 (Miltiades' expedition), but denies that Hecataeus knew of it, because he dates the composition of the *Genealogies* to the 480s, later than the *Periegesis* (Komm. 343, 319 respectively).

[65] See Mazzarino, *Il pensiero storico classico* [n. 13], 550–1; E. Ruschenbusch, 'Eine schriftliche Quelle im Werk Herodots (FGrHist 3, Pherekydes von Athen)', in M. Weinmann-Walser (ed.), *Historische Interpretationen Gerold Walser zum 75. Geburtstag dargebracht von Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern* (Stuttgart, 1995), 131–49 at 143–4.

[66] *Contra* Jacoby's dating between 508/7 and 476/5 ('The First Athenian Prose Writer' [n. 28], Pherecydes of Athens' work is now generally dated 480–460, in any case later than Hecataeus' *Genealogies*: see H. T. Wade-Gery, *The Poet of the* Iliad (Cambridge, 1952), 93–4; G. Huxley, 'The Date of Pherekydes of Athens', *GRBS* 15 (1974), 127–43; L. Piccirilli, *Storie dello storico Tucidide* (Genoa, 1985), 68; D. Viviers, 'Historiographie et propagande politique au V^{ème} siècle avant notre ère: Les Philaïdes et la Chersonèse de Thrace', *RFIC* 115 (1987), 288–313 at 302 ff.; a similar viewpoint also in v. Fritz, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung* [n. 13], ii. 62.

[67] See N. G. L. Hammond, 'The Philaids and the Chersonese', *CQ*, NS 6 (1956), 113–29; S. Mazzarino, *Fra Oriente e Occidente: Ricerche di storia greca arcaica*, 2nd edn. (Milan, 1989), 243; Lanzillotta, 'Milziade nel Chersoneso' [n. 63]; *contra* (499/8) H. T. Wade-Gery, *Essays in Greek History* (Oxford, 1958), 163. For the list of names found at Hephaistia on Lemnos, arranged according to Clisthenic tribes and dated *c.*500 BC, see *ATL* iii (1950), 290–1.

[68] To show Hecataeus' 'philo-barbarism' it is sufficient to refer to F 20 (invention

'antipathy' towards the Athenians. The latter may seem difficult to explain after 499 and the Athenians' help in the Ionian revolt, in spite of Hecataeus' critical view of the revolt itself.[69] But his position on the 'Pelasgic question' would make good sense in the years between 514 and 506, when, in the eyes of an Ionian, Miltiades' conquest could look like an act of tyrannical *hybris* against an innocent people, which moreover had acquired merit by their resistance to the Persians.[70]

As a whole, the principle of likelihood expressed itself in a reduction of the most unbelievable features of myth to everyday experience. As far as possible, Hecataeus introduced variants taken from sources other than the traditional ones. His anti-traditionalism also comes to the surface in his making Greece a barbarian colony (F 119), going against the exaltation of the hellenic identity in the Homeric tradition. Nevertheless, Hecataeus sometimes also believes incredible elements of myth, e.g. the talking ram of Phrixus and Helle (F 17) or Danae becoming pregnant by Zeus' intervention (F 21).

3.3. *The invention of a chronology?*

Up to this point we may credit Hecataeus with a 'rational' rearrangement of tradition, a remarkable advance, without any parallel in Pherecydes' or Acusilaus' *Genealogies*. For Pherecydes, it is still possible to agree with Jacoby, who excluded any sign of 'Ionian rationalism' from his tales, although the obviously propagandistic use of genealogy in the case of the Philaids' stemma and the connection between the mythical past and the historical present show Pherecydes bridging the 'Hesiodic' gap between those two chronological dimensions.[71] As for Acusilaus, in spite of his favouritism towards the Argive tradition and the emendations to Hesiod mentioned by

of writing) and F 119 (prehistoric Greece a colony of barbarians); cf. De Sanctis, 'Intorno al razionalismo di Ecateo' [n. 24], 14–15, and Mazzarino, *Fra Oriente e Occidente* [n. 67], 111–12.

[69] See Hdt. 5. 36; cf. J. A. S. Evans, 'Herodotus and the Ionian Revolt', *Historia*, 25 (1976), 31–7 at 33–4; on the tradition cf. P. Tozzi, *La rivolta ionica* (Pisa, 1978), 139 ff.; B. Virgilio, *Commento storico al quinto libro delle 'Storie' di Erodoto* (Pisa, 1975), 68; S. West, 'Herodotus' Portrait of Hecataeus', *JHS* 111 (1991), 144–60.

[70] See Hdt. 5. 27.

[71] See *FGrHist* 3 F 2, and Komm. 386; more examples of the connection between past and present are given by Hippocrates' (F 59) and Homer's (F 167) genealogy. On the propagandistic aim of the Philaid genealogy see Viviers, 'Historiogaphie

Josephus, he seems to be the most faithful 'translator in prose' of Hesiod, as Clement called him.[72]

Rational explanation is, however, only a first step towards historical discourse. Organizing the *spatium historicum* also requires a chronological arrangement of the events. It is doubtful if this may be attributed to Hecataeus. Eduard Meyer's hypothesis, which became an established fact for his successors, attributes to Hecataeus a genealogical 'backbone' based on some fixed points (the Trojan war, the Heraclids, Spartan genealogies) which were translated into dates reckoning forty years per generation. This construction was already criticized by Pearson,[73] and systematically demolished by F. Mitchel.[74] As a matter of fact, no sign of a chronological use of generations, either as 'comparative genealogy' (Mitchel) or in order to calculate the time elapsed between events by giving a conventional duration to generations, can be found in the *Genealogies*. The fragmentary transmission of Hecataeus also prevents us from seeing a chronological sequence in the narration of the single myths. It is clear that his treatment of the Heracles cycle reached the generation of the Heraclids. In fact, F 30 mentions the difficult relations between Heracles' sons and King Keyx, so that we can suppose that Hecataeus narrated the wanderings of the Heraclids down to their settlement in the Peloponnese, a story Tyrtaeus knew of, and which the *Catalogue* probably did not ignore.[75] It is, how-

et propagande politique' [n. 66], 300 ff.; Bertelli, '"C'era una volta un mito" . . .' [n. 18], 74 ff.

[72] On the Argive tradition see F 23a (Phoroneus); the 'tale' of the finding of the bronze tablets mentioned by the *Suda*; (T 1) might be another way to connect him to local tradition. On the relation to Hesiod see T 5–6. For the dating to the 6th cent. see Mazzarino, *Il pensiero storico classico* [n. 13], 60, and Tozzi, 'Studi su Ecateo di Mileto' [n. 49], IV; Jacoby (*FGrHist* 2 T 2–3, Komm. 375–6), more plausibly, locates him in the first half of the 5th cent. between Hecataeus and Pherecydes.

[73] Pearson, *the Early Ionian Historians* [n. 25], 106.

[74] Mitchel, 'Herodotus' Use of Geneaological Chronology' [n. 25], 64 ff., who, however, explicitly rejects only 'the so-called Hekataian generation of 40 years' as Meyer's 'ingenious conjecture', and not the possibility itself that Hecataeus used a chronology. See also above, n. 50, and Fowler, 'Herodotus and his Contemporaries' [n. 13], 75; *Erodoto: Le Storie. Libro I*, ed. D. Asheri, 4th edn. (Milan, 1997), xxxix n. 1.

[75] The words *ἐς ἄλλον τινὰ δῆμον ἀποίχεσθε* in F 30 might suggest a sequel to the story. For the *Catalogue* see frr. 10a and 233 and West, *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women* [n. 19], 57 ff. , 112–13; on Tyrtaeus see fr. 2. 12–15 W.

ever, worth pointing out that Keyx's role in the story first appears in Hecataeus.[76]

In the well-known meeting with the priests of Thebes in Egypt (F 300, in Hdt. 2. 143), Herodotus depicts Hecataeus the *λογοποιός*[77] as he 'rehearses his genealogy' and 'connects his paternal line to a god as his sixteenth ancestor'. I believe that Hecataeus introduced his lineage in an excursus at the beginning of the *Genealogies*[78] and derived from the comparison with the antiquity of the Egyptians a good argument to refute the claim of the Greek *γένη* to have sprung from a divine ancestor *in the space of a few generations*. Egyptian history showed that the gods had disappeared from men's sight long before the time which could be calculated by the reckoning of the heroic generations.

Herodotus does not give the list of names recited by Hecataeus in his 'full genealogy',[79] but we may suppose that the latter looked like the one of Heropythus the Chian (first half of the fifth century), or like the Philaid genealogy of Pherecydes, which also has a

[76] Cf. F. Prinz, *Gründungsmythen und Sagenchronologie* (Munich, 1979), 221. Hecataeus' version is reflected by the vulgate in Diod. 4. 57. 1–2, and ps.-Apoll. *Bibl*. 2. 167.

[77] Herodotus calls him *λογοποιός*, perhaps not without some irony, for he uses the same word for Aesop (Hdt. 2. 134. 3); as a matter of fact, Herodotus shows a 'malicious joy' (A. B. Lloyd, *Herodotus: Book II, Introduction* (Leiden, 1975), 127) in relating the 'genealogist' Hecataeus' poor show in front of the Egyptian priests, emphasized by the contrast with Herodotus himself, who had refrained from listing his genealogy (2. 143. 1 *καὶ ἐμοὶ οὐ γενεηλογήσαντι ἐμεωυτόν*).

[78] Jacoby lists it as F 300 of the *Periegesis*, with no apparent reason, but is followed by Pearson, *The Early Ionian Historians* [n. 25], 81 ff., Nenci, *Hecataei Milesii Fragmenta* [n. 62], no. 313, Tozzi, 'Studi su Ecateo di Mileto' [n. 49], IV: 53–4; Drews, *The Greek Accounts of Eastern History* [n. 13], 13, proposed the well-founded and reasonable hypothesis 'that the story which Herodotus found appeared in the *Genealogies*, since it would have constituted a perfect preface for a work which was intended to show the foolishness of the Greek *logoi*'. This is accepted by Burkert, 'Lydia between East and West' [n. 25], 147 n. 19, 148 n. 38, who calls this tale a 'conversion story' in which 'the Egyptian experience proved the "*logoi* of the Hellenes" wrong'; cf. already Heidel, 'Hecataeus and the Egyptian Priest' [n. 24], 94. It is in any case important that Hecataeus reconstructs a complete genealogy *going back from the present to the mythical past*. As for the credibility of the episode, A. B. Lloyd, *Herodotus: Book II, Commentary 99–182* (Leiden, New York, and Cologne, 1988), 107–8, presupposes a contamination between Herodotus' experience and his source's; this interpretation seems better founded than that offered by Stephanie West, 'Herodotus' Portrait of Hecataeus' [n. 69], 145 ff. (refuted, incidentally, by W. K. Pritchett, *The Liar School of Herodotus* (Amsterdam, 1993), 187 ff.), who makes it an invention by Herodotus.

[79] On the difference between full genealogy and oral family genealogy see R. Thomas, *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens*, 2nd edn. (Cambridge, 1990), 159 ff.

mythic progenitor at the beginning.[80] In order to reckon how many years Hecataeus' genealogy spanned, we would need to know how many years each generation encompassed. Since Meyer's theory of a forty-year span has been given up, we have either to abandon the possibility of translating Hecataeus' genealogy into a fixed number of years, or else try anew to find out the length of his standard generation. Now, if Mitchel is right in contending that 'Herodotos seems to have recorded the chronology of each story just as it came to him as an integral part of the story itself',[81] it should be possible to calculate the length of Hecataeus' genealogy from Herodotus' narrative of the meeting in Thebes.

In the relevant paragraphs (2. 142–3) Herodotus mentions three sources: first the priests of Thebes, reckoning 341 generations to Sethus, corresponding to 11,340 years on a ratio of 100 years every three generations; this reckoning of the years is part of the narrative—that is, it does not stem from Herodotus.[82] The second source is Herodotus himself, who 'did not rehearse his own genealogy', to whom 341 statues were shown, up to Sethus' time.[83] Third, Hecataeus, who did 'rehearse his genealogy', was shown the statues of 345 *pirōmeis*, in a scene which parallels the one in which Herodotus depicted himself. The four additional statues should represent the time between Sethus and Hecataeus' visit, probably after Cambyses' conquest of Egypt in 525.

With Lloyd, we may suppose that Herodotus conflated his own visit with Hecataeus', taking the latter as a model. From Hecataeus, Herodotus takes the figures he uses in order to reckon 341 generations to Sethus, subtracting four from those seen by Hecataeus; it is also probably from Hecataeus that Herodotus takes the fig-

[80] On Heropythus' pedigree, which embraced fifteen generations and reached a presumably human first ancestor, see Wade-Gery, *The Poet of the* Iliad [n. 66], 8, 91–2 (fig. 1), and Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece* [n. 14], pl. 65, no. 47. Imitation of Homeric genealogies on Hecataeus' part may not be excluded (Glaucus: *Il*. 6. 152 ff., 6 generations; Aeneas: *Il*. 20. 213 ff., 7 generations), with the important difference that his own was a 'historical' genealogy because it connected the first ancestor with the present.

[81] Mitchel, 'Herodotus' Use of Genealogical Chronology' [n. 25], 61; cf. R. Ball, 'Generation Dating in Herodotus', *CQ*, NS 29 (1979), 276–81 at 279; P. Vannicelli, *Erodoto e la storia dell'Alto Arcaismo* (*Sparta—Tessaglia—Cirene*) (Rome, 1993), 25, n. 7.

[82] See Mitchel, 'Herodotus' Use of Genealogical Chronology' [n. 25], 63, who convincingly explains the origin of Herodotus' miscalculation as well.

[83] This derives from 2. 143. 2 *δεικνύντες κολοσσοὺς ξυλίνους τοσούτους ὅσους περ εἶπον*, which can only be the 341 of 2. 142. 1.

ure of 11,340 years and the equivalence three generations = 100 years. The conflation of the two meetings allows the speculation that Hecataeus' narration also ended with the arguments used by Herodotus (2. 142) to show the 'sterminate antichità', the unfathomable depth, of Egypt's past. This would mean that Hecataeus also knew the 'Egyptian standard' of three generations per century[84] and perhaps applied it to his own genealogy, which would have then lasted 550 years, extending with its divine ancestor beyond the age of Neleus, the traditional founder of Miletus.[85]

It is immaterial whether Hecataeus' calculations were sound or not. What matters is that this Egyptian episode allows the hypothesis that Hecataeus not only built up a complete genealogy for himself, going back to a divine ancestor, but also converted it into years by following the Egyptian model. At least in this case, we might credit him with the use of a 'chronological genealogy'.

According to Rosalind Thomas, the reconstruction of a full genealogy, especially if accompanied by the reckoning in years of its length, only becomes possible thanks to the use of writing by the early genealogists, who could confront the different traditions and calculate chronologies in order to build a coherent and unbroken series of successions down to the present. This is the most innovative feature of Hecataeus' 'complete genealogy', as opposed to the tradition of heroic catalogues in which oral tradition was codified. Such catalogues remained closed in the mythic space of the age of gods and heroes, and never reached the narrator's present, notwithstanding the fact that mythic episodes could be modelled on contemporary experiences. By contrast, in Hecataeus the continuous series of generations, particularly if calculated according to their chronological duration, bound together the mythic past and the present. Furthermore, the connection of 'historical' and mythic generations conflated 'private' genealogical memory, which belonged to each family and kept alive in the memory of closer ancestors, and collective 'public' memory, from which the mythic

[84] Mitchel, 'Herodotus' Use of Genealogical Chronology' [n. 25], 63, maintains that Herodotus used this base of calculation only here; Miller, 'Herodotus as Chronographer' [n. 25], 113, also underlines the uniqueness of this reckoning.

[85] On the calculation cf. Wade-Gery, *The Poet of the* Ilias [n. 66], 89; also Lloyd, *Herodotus: Book II, Commentary 99–182* [n. 78], 107 (date varying between 1089/5 and 1076/5); on Neleus, founder of Miletus, see Hdt. 9. 97, and cf. Prinz, *Gründungsmythen und Sagenchronologie* [n. 76], 325 ff.

founder came. In other words, the myth was connected seamlessly with 'family' history, in order to glorify the latter. This fusion between the genealogical temporality of myth and contemporary history, far from disavowing the worth of myth, used it both as a background for the past and as a root for the present.

4. *Conclusions*

In the end, we may say that Hecataeus satisfies the three fundamental requirements of historical discourse: the definition of a standard of analysis for the transmitted material; source criticism and the search for a 'rational' explanation; and (very probably) a chronological backbone to order the events. The invention of 'chronological genealogy', supported by Hecataeus' interpretative principles, was a real innovation and one that paved the way to the birth of fifth-century Greek historiography. The stage for 'great history' was ready; still, the actor was not yet there—in the form of a subject-matter which gave precedence to human history rather than her misty mythical ancestors. But why did Hecataeus decide to undertake the revision of tradition? If we can maintain that without Hecataeus there could have been no Pherecydes, one must also admit that without Xenophanes perhaps the *Genealogies* of Hecataeus would never have seen the light of day, even though Hecataeus already in the *Periegesis* devoted much space to the human dimension of landscape and the tales of local eponymy. Heraclitus (22 B 40 DK) had perceived the relation between Xenophanes and Hecataeus' ἱστορίη, and many years ago Heidel underlined the coherence of aims between the two. As a matter of fact, anti-traditionalism is common to both, but Hecataeus seems to have maintained this attitude even when he was not writing stories of mythic heroes. During the Ionian revolt (Hdt. 5. 36) Hecataeus dissociated himself from the optimism of Aristagoras and his fellows, showing by his map the imbalance of forces between Persia and the small Ionian cities, and adding that, if indeed Aristagoras opted for war, he would then recommend building a powerful navy by using the treasure of the Branchidai in the temple of Apollo: a suggestion that shows no great respect for religion and tradition.

5

Early *Historiē* and Literacy

ROBERT L. FOWLER

THE question whether local or great history came first is ultimately unanswerable for want of evidence. Had we, above, all, the texts themselves, and more information about dates of composition, we could more confidently assess the position of Herodotus in the history of historiography. In the absence of such data, one ought to develop methods of investigation that do not presuppose the priority of one or the other form of history. In an earlier study which attempted to develop such methods, I stressed the sheer number of writers whose work Herodotus might have known,[1] and stressed also that, whatever written texts might have existed, there was a strong sense of local history in the Greek cities long before Herodotus was born, as evidenced by poetry; I would add that many aetiological myths attached to cults and sanctuaries went back a long way and counted as history for the people. There was also a sense of panhellenic history long before Herodotus was born. The Greek sense of ethnicity emerged in the eighth and seventh centuries.[2] Local and panhellenic history existed together and defined one

[1] 'Herodotos and his Contemporaries', *JHS* 116 (1996), 62–87. Local historians whose work Herodotus could have known, and for whom a sufficiently early date is attested, are Charon of Lampsacus, Ion of Chios, Euagon of Samos, Deiochus of Cyzicus, Eudemus of Paros, Democles of Phygela, Hellanicus of Lesbos, Damastes of Sigeion, Xenomedes of Ceos, and Xanthus the Lydian; in addition, there are many others who we may suspect, but cannot prove, were contemporaries. See also the discussion in *Early Greek Mythography* (Oxford, 2000), pp. xxvii ff., from which fragments of the mythographers are here cited.

[2] See Catherine Morgan's brilliant study *Athletes and Oracles: The Transformation of Olympia and Delphi in the Eighth Century* BC (Cambridge, 1990); ead., 'The Origins of Pan-Hellenism', in N. Marinatos and R. Hägg (eds.), *Greek Sanctuaries: New Approaches* (London and New York, 1993), 18–44; Jonathan M. Hall, *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge, 1997); R. Fowler, 'Genealogical Thinking, Hesiod's *Catalogue*, and the Creation of the Hellenes', *PCPhS* 44 (1998), 1–19.

another; each is, semiotically, meaningless without the other. Their birth is coeval with the birth of the poleis, which from the beginning both nurtured their own traditions and laid claim to a position in the Greek world at large.

One might still argue that, whatever the preliterate sense of history, the activity of historiography had necessarily to take one form or the other, local or universal, when it first appeared. The argument presumes a dichotomy which, if invalid or even less than absolute, vitiates any thesis of development from one to the other even more fundamentally than the lack of reliable evidence about the dates of works. In fact, the genres we customarily call local history, universal history, ethnography, and mythography, despite superficial differences, overlap in basic ways. Different historians did different things with the mythical period: some never emerged from it; some ignored it, beginning their story in more recent times; others included it, and brought their stories down to the present day as if there were no break (or even while acknowledging a break)—but whatever the solution, the choice had nothing to do with whether they were writing local or universal history. Even the purely genealogical works, though seeming to be a world away from Herodotus, have much in common with his history, and from a not trivial perspective can be considered part of the same genre; for history is embedded in those genealogies, whether one adheres to a romantic view that they do reflect actual history or (more plausibly) holds that they are retrospectively constructed on the basis of contemporary social reality. The Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* reflects the political landscape of early sixth-century Greece, and tendentious genealogizing remained an honourable tradition for many centuries to come. The poetic enterprise was taken over by prose. Hecataeus, Acusilaus, and Pherecydes took the whole of Greece for their subject, and are called mythographers for their pains; but if I were to take any individual stemma (Inachids, say, or Cadmeans), and make that the exclusive subject of my book, I would be writing the first chapter of a local history and might, like Ion of Chios and many another, be banished to volume iii of *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*.

One might attempt to attach significance to the pattern whereby the earliest universalizing writers (Hecataeus, Acusilaus, Pherecydes) stick to the mythical period, whereas the earliest local historians, though bridging or ignoring the gap, do so only for their own

poleis; it was left to Herodotus to put all these things together in a universal history that clearly articulated the joint, or established the continuum, between remote and recent past. Such a manœuvre would be open to several objections: first, we do not really know, though we might suspect, that Herodotus was the first to do this; second, it fails to do justice to Hellanicus, whose individual works of local history—to say nothing of the universal *Priestesses of Hera*, published about the same time as Herodotus' *Histories*—formed part of a comprehensive research programme; third, it fails to recognize the many links, implicit or explicit, between the mythical subject-matter of Hecataeus (Acusilaus, Pherecydes) and the contemporary world, raising the question whether their decision to concentrate on the remote past arose rather from inclination than inability, myth being the currency of cultural debate.

The methods employed to find out about the past, or in the case of ethnography about a foreign people in the present, were the same.[3] In the large crowd of those we distinguish as mythographers, ethnographers, and historians are to be found many practitioners of more than one genre; those who practise only one are in the minority. Nor did the Greeks distinguish; all these activities are *historiē*, or just *λόγοι*. The difficulty with insisting on a sharp distinction between Herodotus' history and everyone else's is that a quite romantic view of him is bound to result, as an isolated genius who, without benefit of stimulus from other thinkers, transformed himself by sheer force of intellect from ethnographer into historian. This in turn determines one's view of the others: only when he had painted the big canvas could the lesser artists set to work on the details. This, as is well known, was Jacoby's thesis, which he could maintain only by arguing in the teeth of the evidence and the explicit testimony of respectable authorities about the dates of many writers. His belief about the relationship of local history to Herodotus sprang not only from understandable admiration of Herodotus' stupendous achievement, but also from an unconscious belief that the two types of history, being different organisms, must have different developments. In fact they sprouted from the same

[3] G. Shrimpton, *History and Memory in Ancient Greece* (Montreal, 1997), 147, writes: 'I can see no reason for regarding ethnography as anything but a local history of a non-Greek people.' For an extended discussion of the fluidity (or non-existence) of generic boundaries see J. Marincola, 'Genre, Convention and Innovation in Greco-Roman Historiography', in C. Kraus (ed.), *Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts* (Leiden, Boston, and New York, 1999), 281–324.

earth. It does no disservice to Herodotus to place him in the same cultural arboretum as his contemporaries, and to regard him not so much as the inventor of history as the great theorist of its methodology and purposes. It is in consequence of his strictures on method that he limited the scope of his history to the three generations preceding the Persian wars; his understanding of the purpose of *historiē* led him to foreground, in his great proem, the question of motivation. Thucydides, severe as he was, took all this one step further and denied the possibility of writing anything but the history of one's own time.[4] *Historiē* as a genre antedated both. I would have no quarrel with anyone asserting that true 'history' involves the assessment of causes and motives, but I would quarrel with anyone asserting that Herodotus dreamt this up out of nothing as opposed to following up, combining in novel ways, and taking to new heights, as geniuses do, the many hints, stimuli, and leads given by the many thinkers of his day—philosophers, poets, historians, scientists—with whom he had long and fruitful intercourse.[5]

All this means that the scholar who would investigate the origins of historiography must set aside the distinctions between local history, universal history, ethnography, and mythography, and look simply at early *historiē*, bearing the sum of this material in mind. What was the attitude of these early investigators towards the past? What methods did they use to get at it? How did they bridge the gap between remote and recent past? What was their attitude towards what we call myth? Did they ever really escape from μῦθος into λόγος?

These and many other questions might be posed, and would require a book to answer properly. But one question which weaves in and out of all the others, and might profitably be addressed here, is that of literacy and orality. What role did these play in the development of historiography? The question is not identical with the question whether the early historians used predominantly oral or written sources, though they do overlap. That is, in a culture with

[4] See P. Vannicelli, *Erodoto e la storia dell'alto e medio arcaismo* (Rome, 1993), for the three generations; see also his and Roberto Nicolai's contributions in this volume.

[5] On Herodotus' close links with contemporary thinkers see R. Thomas, *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science, and the Art of Persuasion* (Cambridge, 2000); ead., 'Performance and Written Publication in Herodotos and the Sophistic Generation', in W. Kullmann and J. Althoff (eds.), *Vermittlung und Tradierung von Wissen in der griechischen Kultur* (Tübingen, 1993), 225–44.

no writing at all, literate historiography cannot exist; conversely, if historians use nothing but written sources, they will not be doing oral history. So the longer written sources have existed in a culture, and the greater their quantity, the more likely it is that its historiography will be literate. By the early fifth century an easily underestimated quantity of fixed texts was available in Greece as sources for historians—it was, in fact, massive—and for this reason literate methods are to be expected a priori. Are they found in practice? Has the quantity of written texts irrevocably transformed the oral culture? No; even if progress was greater than it has long been fashionable to admit, Greece was definitely still in transition. Although Herodotus uses a surprising number of written sources,[6] his main sources were oral. Moreover, he draws no distinction between them, calling them both λόγοι—stories—which privileges the oral. Herodotus does not think that a story is more reliable simply because it is written down. The environment in which he lived was still predominantly oral; that is how information was shared. So if Herodotus and the others are to be called literate, it is not in the simple sense that they used written sources, or wrote down their own texts. The key lies in how they used their sources, whether written or oral.

Literacy is primarily a state of mind, encouraged by writing, but not automatically produced by it. What early students of this subject designated 'literate' and 'oral' mentalities were in fact different states of development of whole societies, requiring much more careful description. Clearly, huge differences do exist between advanced and early societies; part of the difference has to do with cognitive processes; and advanced societies are literate. Few people nowadays, however, would argue that literacy alone causes the change in cognitive ability. There are many factors contributing to the transformation of society, of which only one is literacy. The precise effects of literacy will depend on the uses to which it is put and its interaction with other factors. Furthermore, even when literacy is widespread and multi-functional, many habits of orality remain; and, conversely, in preliterate societies it is often possible to find habits of mind we commonly associate with literacy. Both exist side by side; they are not opposed as either/or. There are many complex

[6] See Donald Lateiner's chapter on the subject in *The Historical Method of Herodotus* (Toronto, 1989).

states between wholly oral and wholly literate; in fact, the extremes exist only as concepts.[7]

On the other hand, all truly advanced societies are literate, and it seems a priori unlikely that a society possessing sophisticated and widespread literacy would be primitive; so although a single universal effect of literacy cannot be identified, it does seem to be a necessary, if not a sufficient, cause for the advancement of civilization. Moreover, the different state of mind associated with advanced civilization does exist, and if we are not to call it 'literate', it is hard to see what else it might be called. To substitute another dichotomy would only bring a new set of definitional problems. It is probably best to continue speaking of 'literate' in very large inverted commas, recognizing that we are really speaking of a complex state of mind with many causes, one of which, in varying ways, is literacy.

With these provisos in mind, one may offer a few generalizations about the differences between orality and literacy. Orality knows only what is said; literacy seeks external controls on the validity of what is said. Orality recognizes the authority of utterances within a living tradition (a series of such utterances); literacy objectifies the tradition and seeks distance from it. Oral utterances gain authority from their social context; literate statements continue to assert their authority independently of such contexts. All generalizations invite contradiction, but if these may be allowed some validity, the question then becomes: Where does Greek historiography fit on the continuum between wholly oral and wholly literate? The dry recitations of genealogies which characterize early *historiē* might seem unpromising material for such an investigation, and the dearth of verbatim quotations is a serious hindrance; but here and there a handle offers itself.

[7] See esp. R. Thomas, *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge, 1992); also ead., *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens* (Cambridge, 1989), ch. 1; G. E. R. Lloyd, *Magic, Reason, and Experience: Studies in the Origin and Development of Greek Science* (Cambridge, 1979); id., *The Revolutions of Wisdom: Studies in the Claims and Practice of Ancient Science* (Berkeley, 1987), 70 ff., 101; Øivind Andersen, 'Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit im frühen Griechentum', *A&A* 33 (1987), 29–44; Brian V. Street (ed.), *Cross-cultural Approaches to Literacy* (Cambridge, 1993).

1. *Hecataeus*

Everyone keeps coming back, with good reason, to Hecataeus' preface:[8] 'Thus says [*μυθεῖται*] Hecataeus of Miletus: I write [*γράφω*] these words as they seem to me to be true; for the stories [*λόγοι*] of the Greeks, as they seem to me, are many and ludicrous.' Let us leave aside the momentous implications of *γράφω* for the moment, to return to them in connection with Herodotus. Hecataeus' opening statement comes close to problematizing stories *qua* stories, beyond just criticizing their content. Hecataeus' grounds for criticism are twofold: not only that the stories are ridiculous (a criterion for disagreement perfectly within the bounds of oral culture) but that they are many. Truth is monistic. To be sure, people in oral cultures can recognize contradictions as well as anyone, but this is a proem, which announces principles and methods and adopts an argumentative stance. There is a sense that stories must measure up to criteria from outside the world of storytelling.

What these criteria might have been can only be guessed at on the available evidence, but probability or plausibility (*τὸ ἐοικός*) was presumably one. Pausanias, reporting Hecataeus' reinterpretation of Cerberus, says he has produced a *λόγον εἰκότα*; whether the word is his or Hecataeus', the description is just. Hecataeus' celebrated rationalism, which brought high-flying legend to earth by the invention of more realistic (pedestrian, prosaic) alternatives, is of a piece with the proem.[9] It implies embarrassment about myths in general, not just disagreement with the content of particular stories. It implies an objection resting on a principle of potentially universal application; if Hecataeus applied it only inconsistently and somewhat arbitrarily, it does not invalidate the force of his objection or his appreciation of the principle.

[8] It is reassuring to see Lucio Bertelli (in this volume) arriving at a similar understanding of this passage; our two discussions should be read together. See also his article '"C'era una volta un mito . . .": Alle origini della storiografia greca', in *De tuo Tibi: Omaggio degli allievi a Italo Lana* (Bologna, 1996), 49–85. For a different analysis see R. Nicolai, '*Pater semper incertus*: Appunti su Ecateo', *QUCC* 56 (1997), 143–64 at 154–55, 161.

[9] F 19, only twenty sons of Aegyptus came to Greece, not fifty; F 26, Geryon a king of Ambracia; F 27, Cerberus was only a poisonous snake (F 27b, a verbatim quotation, offers a telling formulation: *εἶναι δὲ τὸν ὄφιν δοκέω οὐ μέγαν οὕτως οὐδὲ πελώριον, καὶ τούτου εἵνεκεν τὸν Εὐρυσθέα ἐνδέξασθαι ὡς ἀμήχανον ἐόντα*).

His procedure also implies confidence that probability is an absolute, not a relative, criterion. That is, a thing is either probable or it is not. It will not do to say that it is probable only to Hecataeus, and that other people might find quite contradictory propositions probable. If they do they are simply wrong. The use of the word 'true' in this fragment is revealing. Archaic poetry appeals to the etymological sense of *ἀλήθεια* as 'not-forgetting', which is an oral sense of truth: preserving memory, concealing nothing, speaking frankly and honestly to the members of your community as a member of that community.[10] Hecataeus says he writes what seems to *him* to be true. This is to appropriate truth to oneself from the community. Furthermore, he implicitly claims that everyone ought to agree with him that these stories are true in an objective sense; Hecataeus is no Protagoras, claiming that his truth is his alone, and yours might be quite different. He is claiming authority. His stories will stand up to external testing and will continue to have authority whenever they are read.

It is consistent with this attitude that Hecataeus has abandoned the Muse. To speak on one's own authority ('as it seems to me', *bis*) is to take responsibility for what one says.[11] It means exposing oneself to criticism and having reasons for one's opinions—not only having reasons (for oral poets have reasons for what they say), but *knowing* that one must have reasons, knowing that the game is all about opinions and justification. This is a *meta*-cognitive activity, and literate: keeping track of one's mental processes and their underpinnings even while exercising them.

Hesiod's Muses spoke both truth and lies that seemed like the truth (*Th.* 27–8). It seems odd that they should openly admit mendacity; but in fact they must do so, precisely in order to preserve their credibility. Were they to claim to speak only truth, contradictions among their human mouthpieces would raise insoluble problems and fatally undermine the claim. For the same reason, oracles, whether in content or method of acquisition, must be remote,

[10] See (among many) W. Rösler, 'Wine and Truth in the Greek Symposion', in O. Murray and S. Tecuşan (eds.), *In Vino Veritas* (London, 1995), 106–12; S. Hornblower, *Thucydides* (Baltimore, 1987), 19 n. 13.

[11] Similarly Hornblower, *Thucydides* [n. 10], 73; A. Corcella, 'Geografia e *historie*', in G. Cambiano, L. Canfora, and D. Lanza (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica*, i. *La produzione e circolazione del testo*, pt. 1. *La polis* (Rome, 1993), 265–77 at 276; C. Calame, *The Craft of Poetic Speech in Ancient Greece* (Ithaca and London, 1995), 92; Bertelli, '"C'era una volta"' [n. 8], 68; J. Marincola, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge, 1997), 5.

mysterious, and ambiguous; unqualified and guaranteed assertions would soon put them out of business.[12] The truth of poets and prophets must be understood in this sense. Hecataeus' stance is different. He is making the unqualified claim.

Finally, we note that Hecataeus, following the lead of philosophy,[13] writes in prose. It is easy to underestimate the significance of this move. To abandon poetry is to extricate oneself from a social nexus which is ineluctably oral, for all archaic poetry has an occasion for its publication, involving groups of people coming together to hear their spokesman speak (or sing). The early books of genealogies or legendary narrative may seem to us jejune and unexciting, but their authors thought they were making a positive contribution to knowledge. To shear the poetry of its festive occasion, style, and Muse is to reduce it to the bare 'facts'. This must count as an act of great intellectual imagination. It implies an attitude to the material which it is fair to say is that of a historian towards his object of research. The resulting works were solid meat: consider how many epics Pherecydes must have condensed to produce his ten books.

2. *Making Genealogies*

Rosalind Thomas has astutely pointed out that the very act of producing a comprehensive genealogy is literate.[14] In oral societies one hears only fragments of genealogies. People know only as much as they need to know for particular purposes. No one individual possesses the sum of genealogical lore in the society. It only becomes available when someone of a literate persuasion—usually an anthropologist—goes about putting these fragments together.

The observation applies directly to the early mythographers, but not to them alone. The author of the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* produced genealogies every bit as comprehensive as Pherecydes', and so did Hesiod himself, whether in the presumed original of

[12] Cf. R. Parker, 'Greek States and Greek Oracles', in P. Cartledge and F. Harvey (eds.), *Crux: Essays in Greek History Presented to G. E. M. de Ste. Croix* (London, 1985), 298–326 (300 on the anthropological phenomenon of the 'resistance' of oracles).

[13] Early philosophers' attitude to the cosmos has much in common with early historians' attitude to the past and would provide material for a fruitful comparison.

[14] *Oral Tradition* [n. 7], 181 ff.

the *Catalogue* or in the *Theogony*.[15] Other archaic poets such as Asius of Samos and Cinaethon of Lacedaemon are known to have composed genealogical poetry.[16] Homer's genealogical knowledge, though he never had occasion to display it all at once, was certainly encyclopaedic; indeed, such knowledge was part of any competent poet's equipment, be he epic, lyric, or tragic. Genealogical literature the world over, but perhaps especially in Greece because of the profusion of heroic legend, differs from the genealogizing reported by anthropologists precisely in respect of comprehensiveness. But if making comprehensive genealogies is in itself a literate activity, one would not dub any text containing such genealogies 'literate' without further qualification. They suffice to move the text further towards the literate end of the oral–literate continuum; but literacy and orality mixing everywhere in complex ways, one needs to look at the overall character and context of the work in question. A production like the *Theogony*, though essentially literate, can continue to display many oral characteristics. There being more of these than in the mythographers, Hesiod occupies a place closer to the oral end of the continuum than they. Among his oral characteristics one would count his use of verse and the role of the Muse.

With respect to the genealogies themselves the mythographers evince a new attitude, though not everywhere and not at once. Anyone producing comprehensive genealogies must come to grips with the problem of contradictions. Hecataeus' pugnacity and exaggerated claims of truth constitute a more overt awareness of the problem than the poets display, but probably mean that he did not, like the more open-minded Herodotus, foreground the problem of method itself, cite alternatives, offer test cases, or state first principles; he simply gave his solutions to particular problems and implicitly defied his readers to prove him wrong. Pherecydes seems to have given his genealogies straight, without qualification, variants, or anxiety about truthfulness; although the prose medium in itself implies a certain stance (as argued above), no surviving fragment offers any hint of methodological concern, and one suspects, from the complete absence of a biographical tradition about him—not even the hint of a personality—that his book lacked first-person references and possibly even a proem. Acusilaus' claim to have copied

[15] Cf. my remarks in 'Genealogical Thinking' [n. 2].

[16] Complete list and discussion in M. L. West, *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women* (Oxford, 1985), 4–5.

his genealogies from bronze tablets dug up by his father (T 1) is a cop-out; like Hecataeus, he tries to claim authority other than the Muse's, but unlike Hecataeus he seeks to put himself beyond criticism. The implication that his text contained lore of indescribable antiquity might have been what gave him the reputation of a mystic or sage, and some people did allow him a berth among the Seven Wise Men (T 11). That he started his work with a theogony (unlike Hecataeus and Pherecydes) would have bolstered his claim; it brought him, for instance, to Plato's attention (F 6). Whatever one makes of his stance in his proem (assuming that is where the story of the bronze tablets comes from), it is at least a kind of take on the issue of truth.[17] About the same time as Herodotus, Hellanicus devoted much thought to resolving chronological contradictions in the genealogies; there is no evidence that anyone before him did so.[18]

3. *Texts and Occasions*

Oral compositions are always tied to particular occasions; literate ones are not. Like all generalizations this needs qualification. For technological reasons oral delivery remained an important mode of publication throughout antiquity; but of course the simple fact of being read aloud does not make a literate work oral. The sense in which oral compositions require an occasion is a strong one: the occasion affects the nature of the production itself. The poem is indeed an integral part of the occasion, and the poet is discharging

[17] It would be helpful to know the date of the poem circulating under Epimenides' name, which opens with its famous denunciation of Cretan liars; the story of his 57-year sleep, during which he conversed with Aletheia herself, perhaps came from the proem (so S. Mazzarino, *Il pensiero storico classico*, i (Bari, 1966), 49), in which case he resembles Acusilaus in inventing an impressive authority for his message and attempting to circumvent criticism.

[18] I mean chronological contradictions emerging from a comparison of the great stemmata of heroic legend; contradictions arising within the genealogies of single families may be set right even in oral cultures. The statement that neither Hecataeus, nor Acusilaus, nor Pherecydes worried about large-scale contradictions would take some time to prove and might run counter to some people's expectations, particularly about Hecataeus; the complete evidence will be presented in my commentary on the early mythographers, but in the meantime I may cite the arguments presented in 'Herodotos and his Contemporaries' [n. 1], 74–5, that Hecataeus did not convert generation counts into years, and for Pherecydes the detailed discussion on just this point of A. Uhl, *Pherekydes von Athen: Grundriß und Einheit des Werkes* (diss. Munich, 1963), 94 ff., which reaches a negative conclusion.

an important social role in reflecting the feelings of the participants. All archaic lyric poetry is oral in this sense—though it is not as ephemeral and evanescent, as unfixed, as the purest of oral compositions would be, for the greater poets at any rate froze their poems in writing and circulated them subsequently to and separately from the original performance (occasion). At the other extreme from the purely oral stands a work like Thucydides' history, which he wrote for no particular occasion and intended primarily for circulation among readers, for all eternity as he says (1. 22).

The rhapsodic competitions of archaic Greece stand between these two extremes. They do not affect the nature of the poetry in the same way as the occasions of lyric, if at all. They are external to the poetry; the occasion actually exists for the poetry rather than the other way around. People come to the gathering to hear the poetry; the poems themselves are transportable from one such occasion to another, and need not change at all. Of course, skilled rhapsodes will make minor adjustments to their performances depending on the nature of their audience, but this is not the same kind of intimate relationship between poetry and occasion as exists in lyric. It is not even as intimate a relationship as exists in the song-making portrayed by Homer in the *Odyssey*, where the bard is closely in tune with the feelings of his audience.[19] In those scenes, the poetry is truly part of the occasion; the occasion does not exist for the poetry, and we are closer to the world of lyric than of rhapsodic competition. The very creation of singing competitions breaks the existential bond between oral poetry and social occasion, since the poems might be on any subject whatsoever. Such poems, in a purely oral society, might continue to be oral creations, but the environment is artificial, and encourages the production of prize pieces, lovingly worked up and very liable to become fixed texts. As most scholars believe, when Hesiod went to Euboea and won his tripod, he took his *Theogony* with him;[20] it was a fixed text even then, and he eventually wrote it down. He was closer to the oral roots of epic, certainly, than Choerilus of Samos a couple of centuries later, but the *Theogony* is less oral than most sympotic poetry of Choerilus' day. It is worth stressing too that these competitions took place between poleis; that is a very formal environment, a long way from the intimate breeding-ground of oral poetry within the confines of a

[19] Phemius, 1. 325 ff.; Demodocus, 8. 254 ff., 499 ff.

[20] *Op.* 655; see *Hesiod: Theogony*, ed. M. L. West (Oxford, 1966), 44.

single society, whose values and traditions that poetry encapsulates and perpetuates. It may be doubted whether any poem which transcends the boundary of the polis can be oral. When Solon quotes Mimnermus (fr. 20 W), or when Alcaeus alludes to Homer (fr. 44 Voigt), they are dealing with fixed texts.

The occasions on which we might imagine Herodotus performing excerpts from his *Histories* bear comparison with these competitions. In both cases the occasion existed for the performance, not the other way around. Actually that is even truer of Herodotus, since he was the only performer; the occasion was all his. What was the relationship between what he said on these occasions and the text of the *Histories* as we have it?[21] It seems reasonable to think that it was as close as the relationship between the *Theogony* and the poem Hesiod sang at Chalcis, or as that between the great plan of the *Iliad* and the excerpts Homer sang of an evening. That is, the *Histories* existed in some sense as a fixed text which informed the individual performances. Herodotus would presumably have adapted his performances to suit his particular audience, expanding and curtailing at will, but that is fully within the bounds of literate production (we all do so even now reading our papers at conferences). His master text, whether written or not, could even undergo (certainly did undergo) constant revision, without losing this status as the great book from which each performance is an excerpt. Those who believe that Herodotus was an oral performer in a strong sense must have some difficulty explaining the existence of our text. Obviously *some* relationship exists between our text and the original performances; if not, then those performances are fragments of some completely different discourse about which we can know nothing. One might try to argue that the text was captured by dictation. But if the intention of the argument is to preserve the intimate link between text and occasion such as exists in a purely oral environment by claiming that the occasion which produced the surviving text was a particularly grand ἀπόδεξις, perhaps arranged by an admiring host, whereas on other, less grand occasions texts of different designs came into being, the hypothesis is belied by the text itself.

Although the text displays on every page the marks of oral delivery (how could it be otherwise in a society in which that was

[21] Remarks on the same subject in Thomas, *Literacy and Orality* [n. 7], 125–6; 'Performance and Written Publication' [n. 5], 225 ff.

the primary mode of publication?), the really significant thing is the way literate characteristics are overlaid upon the oral devices. This is far more telling than the oral devices themselves, which caught the attention of early students such as Eric Havelock and led them to claim Herodotus for the oral culture. Most telling of these literate features is the nature of the implied audience in Herodotus' text. We assume that his real audiences were large groups of Greeks gathered at panegyreis such as the Olympic Games, or small groups of Greeks gathered at the homes of eminent Athenians or Thurians; actually, we have no contemporary evidence for this assumption, though it seems reasonable.[22] The implied audience is that implied by the text itself. In a word, Herodotus' implied audience is all of the Greeks. He never speaks in such a way as to exclude any one group, and when he is dwelling on affairs peculiar to any one city, he is careful to explain local customs for the benefit of those who may be unfamiliar with them. This attitude implies that the text is fixed; it will work for any audience, anywhere.

This state of affairs creates an interesting interplay between real and implied audiences. Even if Herodotus did not read from a physical roll in his hands, it would have been obvious, precisely from the way the real audience was addressed as if it were the implied audience, that the text was not identical with the words spoken at this particular performance.[23] The difference would be even more obvious if he used a word like *γράφω*. It would be clear that precisely the same performance could be given tomorrow with a different audience. The real audience will have the sense that they are but a single instantiation of the implied audience, which consists of all the people who might potentially hear such a recitation.

Conversely, the many devices of oral composition in the text serve to give the implied audience a sense of what it was like to have been present at the live performance, and gives them the warrant to read the text as if it were being orally presented. Take the opening sentence: *Ἡροδότου Ἁλικαρνησσέος ἱστορίης ἀπόδεξις ἥδε*. This is hardly imaginable in anything but the written form of the text,[24]

[22] The evidence is all late; see W. A. Johnson, 'Oral Performance and the Composition of Herodotus' Histories', *GRBS* 35 (1994), 229–54.

[23] I appeal again to the point made above, that the text performed orally must have some relation with the surviving written text.

[24] As Alan Griffiths reminds me; at live performances the introduction would presumably have been handled differently. See also L. Koenen, 'Der erste Satz bei Heraklit und Herodot', *ZPE* 97 (1993), 95–6.

but the word *ἀπόδεξις* comes from the world of rhetorical display, and makes it easy to imagine Herodotus on the platform, holding forth. The deictic pronoun with first-person reference proudly announces the work as his; although grammatically it refers to the text, in the imagination it refers to the performer.

All the oral devices in Herodotus hover in this interesting way between the world of the implied and real audiences. One could even go so far as to call them pseudo-oral devices—not because they are written down or because they did not work like real oral devices at performances, but because they only seemingly ignore the non-oral audience. A very similar phenomenon is found in Greek lyric poetry. Ruth Scodel, in a fine discussion, dubs it 'pseudo-intimacy'.[25] Lyric poems, too, were written down, circulated among a wider audience, and reused for new purposes. The awareness of this wider audience eventually crept into the texts themselves. Though still composing poems for particular occasions, the poets do so in such a way that others can appreciate them. Pindar is the best example. His epinician odes, indeed, will fail of their stated purpose of conferring immortal *κλέος* if no one other than the original audience can understand them. It is noticeable that, though he fills his odes with local colour, Pindar is careful to provide the reader with enough information to make sense of it all. By contrast, Alcman's references to local cult and myth are often incomprehensible to outsiders; he either did not foresee the possibility that such people would read them (which seems unlikely, as Sparta was not isolated in his day, and outsiders were certainly known to *him*), or he did not care, and the only posterity that mattered to him was that of Sparta, where, he could presume, the audience would always understand the allusions (for he would hardly entertain the possibility that the cults or myths to which he refers would change or die). In time the professional lyric poets all have one eye on posterity. They continue to write for specific occasions, but the impression that the poem is written for the participants only is superficial. Eventually the continued existence of the poems, in written form, became more important; the book culture triumphed. By the hellenistic period even the occasions could be fictitious. So lyric too, like epic before it, was divorced from the occasions of its performance, and became purely literary. The beginnings of this

[25] 'Self-correction, Spontaneity, and Orality in Archaic Poetry', in I. Worthington (ed.), *Voice into Text: Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece* (Leiden, 1996), 59–79.

process are visible in the phenomenon of pseudo-intimacy in archaic lyric. And if lyric poetry, which remained more closely allied with ephemeral occasions than historiography in the fifth century, is shot through with pseudo-intimacy, it is not so far-fetched to call Herodotus' stance pseudo-oral.

The early mythographers, to return finally to them, display the same characteristics. The paucity of verbatim quotations makes it difficult to assess their works in many ways, but if one looks hard enough the indications are clear. Once again the first fragment of Hecataeus takes pride of place. 'Thus says Hecataeus of Miletus: I write these words as they seem to me to be true; for the stories of the Greeks, as they seem to me, are many and ludicrous. ' 'I write', of course, signifies a book; it separates the text from its oral instantiation, and at once establishes the disjunction of real and implied audience. But one can say rather more than this. Two recent studies[26] have established that the natural parallels for 'thus says X' followed by statements in the first person are official edicts (especially of kings, and especially of the Persian king, often publicly inscribed), open letters, official messages, instructions, and the like; numerous examples can be cited from Herodotus, e. g. 5. 24. 1 (*Ἰστιαῖε, βασιλεὺς Δαρεῖος τάδε λέγει· ἐγὼ κτλ.*) and 7. 150. 2 (*Ἄνδρες Ἀργεῖοι, βασιλεὺς Ξέρξης τάδε ὑμῖν λέγει· ἡμεῖς κτλ.*). The effect of the preamble is to designate what follows as a public proclamation or a letter from a very important person.[27] Archaic poets exploited the device: Susarion (*IEG* ii. 167) pretends actually to be addressing an assembly when he says, *ἀκούετε λεῴ· Σουσαρίων λέγει τάδε υἱὸς Φιλίνου Μεγαρόθεν Τριποδίσκιος*; the formulaic advertisement in the sayings of Phocylides and Demodocus, *καὶ τόδε Φωκυλίδου/ Δημοδόκου*, strikes a similar attitude, though it lacks a verb of saying and proceeds (as did Susarion) to a gnomic rather than a first-person utterance. Applied to Hecataeus' proem, the parallels reveal that his message is not, in the first instance, that the Greeks tell silly stories; the message is that he is writing. 'I write these words' is what the imaginary herald would read out. Hecataeus throws the written-ness of his book into high relief. As one listens (or reads), one can almost see him composing it; he knows as he writes that

[26] L. Porciani, *La forma proemiale: Storiografia e pubblico nel mondo antico* (Pisa, 1997); A. Corcella, '"Ecateo di Mileto così dice"', *QS* 43 (1996), 295–301.

[27] The form of the proem is very much part of Hecataeus' pretensions to authority; cf. above, sect. 1.

his message will be received *primarily* at a distance. And it follows directly from this understanding of Hecataeus' proem that when he refers to the stories of the 'Greeks', he has named his implied audience.[28]

Only one other fragment in the corpus clearly betrays an implied audience, but it is a very telling instance. Pherecydes of Athens, identifying a local eponym, says 'To Metion son of Erechtheus and Iphinoe was born Daedalus, after whom the deme Daedalidae at Athens is called' (F 146). The addition 'at Athens' is significant; the implied audience is non-Athenians. The real audience would often have been Athenian; but they would have enjoyed the conceit that others wanted to hear about the eponymous forebears of Attic demes as much as they did. In view of this fragment we should assess others in the same way: 'in Argos' is added to the eponym in F 66, 'in Italy' in F 156, 'in Sparta' in F 168, not for the enlightenment of ignorant Athenians, but for anyone who might potentially read the book.

Another fragment, a little more difficult to assess, is Ion of Chios F 1, from his *Foundation of Chios*. Pausanias (7. 4. 8) gives a summary of the first part of the book, down to the point were the Chians decided to sacrifice at the Panionion, as their ruler Hector remembered that they ought to do. Pausanias reports Hector's sudden recollection of this requirement, but adds in a puzzled way that he was unable to discover from Ion's book why the Chians were thought to count as Ionians. This could be read in two ways, as far as implied audiences are concerned. The first is that Ion did not need to tell his Chian audience why they were Ionians. The second, which I think more likely, is that he has deliberately avoided the issue because of the wider audience of non-Chians. His version of the foundation of the island, which obviously draws on local lore, is inconsistent with the widely accepted myth that Ionian lands were colonized from Athens. Yet he must make a connection with the Ionians, for ethnic reasons; the Chians were Ionian. And he *wants* to have a connection with Athens, for political reasons; the Athenian alliance was of the utmost importance. He forges this connection by making the founder

[28] Cf. G. F. Nieddu, 'Neue Wissensformen, Kommunikationstechniken und schriftliche Ausdrucksformen in Griechenland im sechsten und fünften Jahrhundert v. Chr.: Einige Beobachtungen', in Kullmann and Althoff (eds.), *Vermittlung und Tradierung* [n. 5], 151–65 at 153–4; Marincola, *Authority and Tradition* [n. 11], 272.

Oenopion a son of Theseus. This move alone suggests that he was thinking of a wider audience, if it does not actually prove it. At any rate, the problems of explaining why Chians were Ionians in the first place, given the myth as Ion has conceived it, would cause greater embarrassment to its author among the wider audience than among Chians; so I think he suppressed discussion for reasons of tact.

An indirect indication of the implied audience consists in the tone and style of the surviving quotations. Specific stylistic devices apart, they are all very similar in their matter-of-fact relation of mythical narratives. Only Hecataeus, Herodotus, and Thucydides have distinctive personal voices. The others proceed like newspaper reporters. It makes no difference whether the subject is local or panhellenic; it makes no difference whether the writer is a foreigner or a native. The history of Argos is told by Acusilaus of Argos and Hellanicus of Lesbos in the same way, so as to be accessible to everyone. The implied audience is everyman.

Finally, and most conclusively, there is the dialect. There is no reason for Acusilaus and the others to adopt Ionian for their books unless their audience was international. The point needs no argument; but on the subject of dialect, a later phenomenon may be mentioned, which illustrates the point *e contrario*. In the fourth century a reaction set in, and some writers of local history, notably Agias/Dercyllus of Argos, deliberately used their own dialects. The audience, however, remained the same. The one surviving quotation from Agias' book finds him carefully describing the sources of various ritual waters, and the names of the maidens who draw them: 'From the well called the Hippeion maidens called the Heresides draw lustral water for Hera Akraia; from the well called the Automateion maidens called the Locheutriai draw lustral water whenever one of the servant women is in labour.' The Argives did not need to be told all this, and the implied audience is probably foreign;[29] thus the reason for the local dialect is not to give the local

[29] I concede that though the Argives did not need to be told this they might have enjoyed being told. However, this book is but one instance of the wider phenomenon of prose in epichoric dialect, which A. C. Cassio has done much to elucidate; these texts circulated abroad and were self-conscious exercises in image-creating. See A. C. Cassio, 'Storiografia locale di Argo e dorico letterario: Agia, Dercillo ed il Pap. Soc. Ital. 1091', *RFIC* 117 (1989), 257–75; 'Lo sviluppo della prosa dorica e le tradizioni occidentali della retorica greca', in A. C. Cassio and D. Musti (eds.), *Tra Sicilia e Magna Grecia* (*AION* 11; 1989), 137–57.

audience a break, but to give the foreign audience an epichoric experience. If lyric is pseudo-intimate, and Herodotus is pseudo-oral, this is pseudo-local.

We may conclude that from the beginning, mythography was occasion-free, panhellenic, and in these respects literate.

4. *Past and Present*

To conclude, a brief but important point. Poetry and early *historiē* differ in the way they acknowledge the relationship of past to present. Poetry rarely draws attention explicitly to the connection. Pindar, for instance, tells stories of Ajax and Achilles in his epinicia for Aeginetan victors; the audience does not need to be told that the spirit of the former breathes in the bodies of the latter, still very much alive. This is to see the past as a world of ghosts animating present-day people. It is to see them as identical, differing only in mode of apprehension. It is to collapse the distance and elide the difference. Epic too only rarely admits the remoteness of the past. Curiously, in spite of dozens of eponyms it has occasion to mention, the *Catalogue of Women* only once deigns to point out the connection with existing place names,[30] whereas the practice is ubiquitous from Hecataeus on (*ἀφ' οὗ νῦν ἡ πόλις καλεῖται* and the like).[31] The locution admits the existence of the gap. Historians from the start were concerned to develop tools to bridge that gap. The attitude to the past is fundamentally different; it is critical.

A stylistic habit of historians—their use of the historic present—might seem to make against the generalizations of the last paragraph, inasmuch as the historians used it to 'impart dramatic vividness, bringing narrator and audience into the scene, while the epic poet, by contrast, was concerned with the commemoration of a remote, ancestral past'. Thus K. J. Dover in his latest work,[32] where he discusses the phenomenon with typical tact. He is surely right to argue that, though they knew the tense, the epic poets deliberately eschewed it. But one would not conclude from his assessment that the historians pretended that the gap was not there, while the epic

[30] New fragment identified by Luppe; see OCT, 3rd edn., p. 190a.

[31] The one extensive quotation from the book of Pherecydes of Syros, fr. 68 Schibli, contains two explicit aitia; a nice point of contact with historiography (cf. above, n. 13).

[32] *The Evolution of Greek Prose Style* (Oxford, 1997), 68.

poets had the stronger sense of distance from the past. The poets were granted direct access to the past by the Muse, and sought to keep alive the fame of olden heroes—keep *alive*, as if they never died, and walk among us yet. The historians did not use the historic present alone, but alternated it constantly with aorists and imperfects. Every alternation, being entirely in the historian's discretion, makes it plain that the past is brought thus vividly before our eyes by *his* intervention.

The awareness of the gap obtrudes in different ways from historian to historian, but the awareness is always there.[33] Hecataeus' interest in eponyms is natural enough in the geographer (another form of *historiē*). Pherecydes in F 2 brings the Philaid genealogy down close to his own time; on the evidence, this appears to be a rare breach of the boundary in him, and accords well with some other characteristics such as his failure to discuss method and his apparent antipathy to rationalization.[34] But he has plenty of eponyms (e.g. FF 1, 27?, 39, 66, 95, 101, 135, 146, 168, probably also 111; cf. Hes. fr. 263). Acusilaus offers a couple of eponyms (FF 25, 43), and also discusses the lineage of a contemporary group, the Home-

[33] On Herodotus' awareness of the 'floating' chronological gap see R. Thomas in this volume. On Hecataeus and Pherecydes see also Bertelli, '"C'era una volta"' [n. 8], 69–79.

[34] F 38 on Niobe's petrification seems almost deliberately worded so as to preclude a rationalizing account: 'Niobe prayed to Zeus to become a stone. Tears flow from her, and she looks toward the north.' E. Ruschenbusch, 'Eine schriftliche Quelle im Werk Herodots (*FGrHist* 3, Pherekydes von Athen)', in M. Weinmann-Walser (ed.), *Historische Interpretationen Gerold Walser zum 75. Geburtstag dargebracht von Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern* (Stuttgart, 1995), 131–49, argues that in all cases where Herodotus gives a genealogy that stretches from the heroic age to recent history (and these are numerous), his source is Pherecydes, because (1) they all have the same structure and purpose (p. 138: 'Die ersten drei bis fünf Glieder [i.e. at the lower end] sind authentisch, der Rest eine Erfindung. Als Einzelstücke langweilig, ergeben sie erst zusammengenommen ein buntes Gewebe. Sie sind nicht Selbstzweck, sondern haben nur die Aufgabe, als Gerüst den Ausgangspunkt für Geschichten zu bieten, so wie es bei Herodot der Fall ist') and (2) neither Hecataeus nor Acusilaus is a candidate, 'da beide sich auf den Mythos beschränken' (141; not strictly true for Hecataeus, at least in respect of his own genealogy, T 4, and note Acus. F 2 on the Homeridae), whereas Pherecydes treated recent history in F 2. He may also have brought the genealogy of Hippocrates down to his own time (F 59), but as he is only one of several authorities cited by Soranus, we cannot be sure of this, *pace* Ruschenbusch n. 16 and others. (1) is wholly specious; the same is true of most genealogies. As for (2), it is awkward that the one genealogy on which Ruschenbusch must rely, that of the Philaids (F 2), conspicuously and notoriously contradicts Herodotus; Ruschenbusch does not even mention this, simply reporting Pherecydes' genealogy as rewritten to agree with Herodotus. *Contra* see Thomas, *Oral Tradition* [n. 7], 161 ff.

ridae (F 2); in the only extensive verbatim quotation, F 22 on the Lapith Caeneus, we find him speaking frankly of 'the men of those days'. Hellanicus' chronography speaks for itself; see, for instance, F 169, which in one sweeping period sorts out the chronology in generations (three between each one) of the four great trials on the Areopagus, details provided parenthetically for each one—as literate a piece of writing as one could wish to find. Local historians, on the evidence, routinely carried their accounts as it were down to the day before yesterday; and Herodotus took the radical step of abandoning the olden times to the poets as unfit for historical research.

He did not, however, carry his programme through with perfect consistency. Though he was a literate historian, the literate/oral distinction is ours, not his. He could formulate literate criteria and methods, but he could not understand his procedures in those terms, nor recognize the difference in his sources, nor (in consequence) apply his methods in every circumstance where we might expect him to. Until the distinction oral/literate is fully worked out, one never wholly escapes from one to the other, if even then—just as we never really escape from *μῦθος* into *λόγος*. Many oral habits of thought and speech survive the advent of literacy, and study of these devices in their own right and as they mix with literate forms has much enriched our understanding of Greek civilization. Several decades of research have produced a much more satisfying understanding of these terms. Because it was the less understood, orality has received far greater attention, and ways in which Greek society was oral rather than literate have been diligently sought. It is well from time to time to remind ourselves that Greek civilization was quite amazingly literate; that has always been their claim to fame. Many scholars still believe that Homer was literate in 700 BC, and a recent article by Ken Dowden has boldly argued that the epics he drew on for the *Iliad* were themselves fixed texts.[35] Certainly they were by the time Pherecydes sat down to condense them into his ten books of history. This was a pre-eminently literate activity; and so was all of Greek historiography, from start to finish.

[35] 'Homer's Sense of Text', *JHS* 116 (1996), 47–61.

6

Constructing the Past: Colonial Traditions and the Writing of History. The Case of Cyrene

MAURIZIO GIANGIULIO

1. *Historical Memory, Invention of the Past, and Collective Identity: The Nature and Function of Foundation Tales*

ORIGINS are crucial. As anthropological studies have shown, every society's sense of collective identity is established and expressed by traditions about its past. It is the social memory that lends continuity to the awareness of the distinctive nature of one group's experience. Thus, to recollect one's own past is immediately to identify oneself.[1] It will be no surprise, then, to find that traditions of origin structure corporate identity and that societies, in turn, understand themselves in terms of their origin. After all, reality

My warm thanks go to the editor of this volume, Nino Luraghi, for his original invitation to contribute, and for discussions since. I am also grateful to Oswyn Murray for some stimulating comments. Franco Basso, Anna Lina De Rogatis, Carla Sassi, and an anonymous referee gave much-needed advice on form and substance. Later versions greatly benefited from the generous scrutiny of Ettore Cingano and Luigi Lehnus. For what follows I alone, of course, am responsible.

[1] On the relevance of the past to corporate identity in 'primitive' societies, it should be sufficient to cite R. Schott, 'Das Geschichtsbewußtsein schriftloser Völker', *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte*, 12 (1968), 166–205; see also J. Vansina, *Oral Tradition as History* (London and Nairobi, 1985), 105, and, most recently, M. Schuster, 'Zur Konstruktion der Geschichte in Kulturen ohne Schrift', in J. v. Ungern-Sternberg and H. Reinau (eds.), *Vergangenheit in mündlicher Überlieferung* (Colloquium Rauricum, 1; Stuttgart, 1988), 57–71. The distinctive nature of social memory and the part it plays in the shaping of cultural identity are masterfully discussed in J. Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen* (Munich, 1992).

cannot be explained without going back to one's origins. As one of the Ngoni 'historians' once said to Margared Read, who intended to investigate other aspects of their social life: 'First you ought to know about our beginnings.'[2] Indeed, reality itself is sometimes established by a sense of collective identity. Instances are known, in fact, in which it is only the claim of its origin that constitutes a group as such, by distinguishing it from others.[3] However, we are always dealing with creative remembering, which implies complex processes of cultural construction of the past itself. The explanatory function of a past considered as a given is not at stake here. What is relevant, instead, is the relationship between group consciousness, self-definition, and 'invention' of the past.

The Greeks are no exception. Regarding the relationship between identity and invention of the past, at least, one should not stress the distinctive nature of Greek civilization. But I shall not advance any further general suggestions here. I shall concentrate, instead, on Greek colonial traditions and on the extent to which they shaped the community's sense of identity and distinctiveness.

Let us first consider a couple of significant examples. Traditions about the founding of Cyrene and Croton cast a particular light on the origins of these cities.[4] The decisive role played by the Delphic oracle is very strongly emphasized, through various narrative devices, much more so than in other cases. It is important to stress not only that the founders of Cyrene and Croton are represented as if they were the human agents of Apollo, but also that in both cases the origins of the city appear to be a direct expression of the Delphic

[2] M. Read, 'Tradition and Prestige among the Ngoni', *Africa*, 9 (1936), 453–84 at 463, to which attention is drawn in Schott, 'Das Geschichtsbewußtsein schriftloser Völker' [n. 1], 190.

[3] So Vansina, *Oral Tradition as History* [n. 1], 105, with reference to the Lumbee of North Carolina.

[4] Cyrene: see Pind. *Pyth*. 4. 59–62, esp. 60, ML no. 5, esp. l. 24, and Hdt. 4. 155 ff. On the much-disputed question of where the 'Cyrenean version' ends, see F. Jacoby, 'Herodotos', *RE* suppl. ii (1913), 205–520 at 435–6; M. Giangiulio, 'Deformità eroiche e tradizioni di fondazione: Batto, Miscello e l'oracolo delfico', *ASNP*[3] 11 (1981), 1–24 at 4 n. 7; *Erodoto: Le Storie*, iv. *Libro IV: La Scizia e la Libia*, ed. A. Corcella, S. M. Medaglia, and A. Fraschetti (Milan, 1993), 333; C. Calame, *Mythe et histoire dans l'antiquité grecque: La Création symbolique d'une colonie* (Lausanne, 1996), 135 and n. 117; differently A. L. Graham, 'The Authenticity of the *ὅρκιον τῶν οἰκιστήρων* of Cyrene', *JHS* 80 (1960), 94–111 at 96–7 and n. 11; P. Vannicelli, *Erodoto e la storia dell'alto e medio arcaismo* (Rome, 1993), 133 n. 20. As for Croton, see Hippys *FGrHist* 554 F 1 ap. Zenob. 3. 42; Antioch. *FGrHist* 555 F 10 ap. Strabo 6. 1. 12; D.S. 8. 17.

god's will. The unexpected and even spontaneous prophecy, the founder's reluctance, and the importance attached to the god's will are an integral part of a representational strategy meant to depict the foundation as an event brought about by the oracular god.[5]

Also, by declaring a special link with Delphi these traditions claim a special cultural quality for the community. Croton and Cyrene represent themselves—it would seem—as poleis which stand high in Apollo's favour. We can safely assume that such 'Delphic connection' was a matter of the highest importance to a colonial society. What seems clearly at stake here is the creation and diffusion of a fundamental component of the collective identity.[6] This is not sheer propaganda. Rather, we are dealing with the terms in which an archaic community could understand itself. And it is not by chance that the traditions of origin at issue were deeply rooted in the polis religion: an integral part of the heroic tale of the founder, they represent a sort of narrative equivalent, preserved in the collective memory, of the civic cult of the latter.[7] On the other hand, this religious dimension is witness to the city's awareness that the hero responsible for its origins was the sacred embodiment of its collective 'personality'.[8]

We are evidently dealing with a form of 'sacred identity'.[9] This is not surprising, for something out of the ordinary—as Assmann has reminded us—is always intrinsic to collective identity.[10] But there

[5] See Giangiulio, 'Deformità eroiche e tradizioni di fondazione' [n. 4]; T. J. Cornell, 'Gründer' (A), *RAC* xii (1983), 1108–45 at 1130–1; C. Calame, 'Mythe, récit épique et histoire: le récit hérodotéen de la fondation de Cyrène', in C. Calame (ed.), *Métamorphoses du mythe en Grèce antique* (Geneva, 1988), 105–25 at 115–16; M. Giangiulio, *Ricerche su Crotone arcaica* (Pisa, 1989), 134–40; J. F. McGlew, *Tyranny and Political Culture in Ancient Greece* (Ithaca, NY, and London, 1993), 19–20, and, most recently, the acute observations of Calame, *Mythe et histoire* [n. 4], 133–5, 137, 143–5, 150–3.

[6] For sensible remarks about founding traditions and collective identity see now McGlew, *Tyranny and Political Culture* [n. 5], esp. 21–3.

[7] See Calame, 'Mythe, récit épique et histoire' [n. 6], 122; McGlew, *Tyranny and Political Culture* [n. 5], 23; Calame, *Mythe et histoire* [n. 4], 156.

[8] On the founder's role see P. Weiß, 'Lebendiger Mythos: Gründerheroen und städtische Gründungstraditionen im griechisch-römischen Osten', *WJA* 10 (1984), 180–208; J. H. M. Strubbe, 'Gründer kleinasiatischer Städte: Fiktion und Realität', *AncSoc* 15–17 (1984–6), 253–304; T. S. Scheer, *Mythische Vorväter: Zur Bedeutung griechischer Heroenmythen im Selbstverständnis kleinasiatischer Städte* (Munich, 1993).

[9] For the religious dimension of collective identity see G. M. Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesus: Foundation Myths of a Roman City* (London and New York, 1991).

[10] Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis* [n. 1], 52–3.

may be more to it than that. Traditions of origin must of course be preserved and repeated. And it is a ceremonial occasion which provides the most fitting context for the circulation and transmission of foundation tales. Only the religious dimension of the public cult makes the past forever present. We must evidently regard the founder's cult as the religious context for the annual commemoration of the foundation legend,[11] but a major festival could also be involved. The foundation of Cyrene, for instance, is associated with the Karneia, which was particularly relevant to the community as a whole and its origins. As Pindar put it: *Ἄπολλον, τεᾷ, Καρνήϊ', ἐν δαιτὶ σεβίζομεν Κυράνας ἀγακτιμέναν πόλιν.*[12]

In this way foundation tales become established as tradition. And yet, what turns out to be part of the collective memory is to be regarded as 'intentional history'.[13] What appears to be at work, in fact, is a form of social memory which establishes both the image of the past the community wishes to transmit and its corporate identity. A Greek colony was a 'new polis' without a past, in a sense, and its citizens were especially in need of a sense of belonging to a community.

It becomes apparent, at this point, that foundation legends do

[11] The evidence for the founder's cult has been discussed recently by Cornell, 'Gründer' [n. 5], 1139–42; W. Leschhorn, *'Gründer der Stadt': Studien zu einem politisch-religiösen Phänomen der griechischen Geschichte* (Stuttgart, 1984), esp. 98–105; I. Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece* (Leiden, 1987), 195–266; see also, in this connection, the pertinent observations of C. Dougherty, *The Poetics of Colonization: From City to Text in Ancient Greece* (New York and Oxford, 1993), 24–6.

[12] *Pyth.* 5. 79–81. On the Karneia and their relevance for the community as a whole see above all A. Brelich, *Paides e parthenoi* (Rome, 1993), 148–53; W. Burkert, *Greek Religion* (Oxford, 1985), 234–6, and, most recently, I. Malkin, *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean* (Cambridge, 1994), 149–58, who has observed that 'the transfer and re-establishment of Apollo Karneios both accomplish the foundation itself and are recalled through its festival' (156). The Karneia are also regarded as a foundation festival by E. Krummen, *Pyrsos Hymnon: Festliche Gegenwart und mythisch-rituelle Tradition als Voraussetzung einer Pindarinterpretation* (*Isthmie 4, Pythie 5, Olympie 1 und 3*) (Berlin and New York, 1990), 108–11, and Calame, *Mythe et histoire* [n. 4], 126, plausibly maintains that both the celebration of the polis and the cult of the founder were part of the Cyrenean Karneia; R. Nicolai, 'La fondazione di Cirene e i Karneia cirenaici nell'Inno ad Apollo di Callimaco', *MD* 27 (1992), 153–73, and Dougherty, *The Poetics of Colonization* [n. 11], 112–16, are also relevant.

[13] On this subject H.-J. Gehrke, 'Mythos, Geschichte, Politik—antik und modern', *Saeculum*, 45 (1994), 239–64, is now essential reading; for his view of 'intentional history' see esp. 257: 'Geschichte, die ein wesentliches Element von Selbstvergewisserung, Ortsbestimmung und Identitätsstiftung und -wahrung ist'.

not derive from the simple need to preserve a record of the past. Cultural memory does not 'reflect' historical reality, even if it expresses a form of historical self-awareness. It is inevitably affected by the constraints and actualities of the present, and it reveals the concerns of the society whose identity it asserts. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to rule out on a priori grounds the notion that cultural memory also employs historical material. To emphasize the active and constructive nature of foundation tales means not putting the part played by historical memory completely aside.

There seems to be a need for a systematic reconsideration of Greek traditions of origin in general—not only colonial *κτίσεις*, but every tradition which accounts for the origins of a Greek community. In both cases the critical issue turns out to be the nature of such traditions.

It is not the aim of this paper to approach this problem in general terms. An attempt will be made, instead, to discuss an individual case. Looking at a local context may help us to understand both the meaning of the past for an archaic Greek community and the exact nature of local memory. I shall concentrate here first on the traditions of origin of Cyrene and on the extent to which they have been orally transmitted (2.1). The next section (2.2) examines the role played by the changing needs of the present in shaping these colonial traditions, and Section 2.3 faces the problem of their alleged 'epichoric' nature. In the last part of this paper (3) I shall discuss the making of the Cyrenean foundation legend reported by Herodotus and the relationship which develops between local traditions and what Jacoby used to call 'great historiography'.

2. *Colonial Traditions between Orality and Writing: From Thera to Cyrene*

> Publicis litteris consignatam memoriam publicam nullam habemus. CICERO, *De legibus*, 3. 20. 46

2.1. *What kind of orality?*

Let us consider traditions concerning the origins of Cyrene. Characteristics typical of a long oral transmission are not lacking, e.g. from the 'Cyrenean version' of the foundation legend (Hdt. 4. 154–

6): 'a typical folktale' (as O. Murray put it) 'of wicked stepmothers and spontaneous signs from Delphi'.[14] But there is more to it than that. We are dealing at the same time with the heroic legend of Battus, which is undoubtedly related to the founder's cult at the 'gathering-place' of the city.[15] It is this ceremonial occasion that provided a ritual and civic context for Cyrene's foundation tale, its continued circulation and transmission. In a non-literate society no written text was needed to pass on such a tradition. On the other hand, no concrete evidence, despite what has sometimes been maintained,[16] supports the existence of local written chronicles. There is

[14] See O. Murray, *Early Greece*, 2nd edn. (London, 1993), 118; on the overall character of the tradition see also J. K. Davies, 'The Reliability of the Oral Tradition', in L. Foxhall and J. K. Davies (eds.), *The Trojan War: Its Historicity and Context* (Bristol, 1984), 87–110 at 93–5, who points out many elements which possibly imply 'a process of decay or decomposition' of an oral tradition. Any general discussion of the subject must start from W. Pohlmann, *De arte qua fabellae Herodoteae narratae sint* (Göttingen, 1912), and W. Aly, *Volksmärchen, Sage und Novelle bei Herodot und seinen Zeitgenossen* (Göttingen, 1921; repr. with corrections and afterword by I. Huber, Göttingen, 1969), esp. 137–8, but the recent work of J. Cobet is of fundamental significance: see J. Cobet, 'Herodot und die mündliche Überlieferung', in Ungern-Sternberg and Reinau (eds.), *Vergangenheit in mündlicher Überlieferung* [n. 1], 226–33 at 230 and n. 14, and id., 'Herodot', in *Enzyklopädie des Märchens*, vi (Berlin and New York, 1990), 851–7; O. Murray, 'Herodotus and Oral History', in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg and A. Kuhrt (eds.), *Achaemenid History*, ii. *The Greek Sources*(Leiden, 1987), 93–115, reprinted in this volume, is also important on this point.

[15] On Battus' legend see A. Brelich, *Gli eroi greci* (Rome, 1958), 130, 132, 243–5, 289, 316–17; Giangiulio, 'Deformità eroiche e tradizioni di fondazione' [n. 4]; Calame, 'Mythe, récit épique et histoire' [n. 5], 122–3; see also, most recently, Calame, *Mythe et histoire* [n. 4], 154–5, and T. Miller, *Die griechische Kolonisation im Spiegel literarischer Zeugnisse* (Tübingen, 1997), 107–8. For Battus' heroic cult see Pind. *Pyth*. 5. 93–5 (also Σ *Pyth*. 5. 124–5, 126, 127a; Σ Ar. *Plut*. 925); *SEG* ix. 72 = Sokolowski, *LSS* no. 115. 21, with H. Büsing, 'Battos', in Th. Lorenz (ed.), *Thiasos: Sieben archäologische Arbeiten* (Amsterdam, 1978), 66–72; Leschhorn, *'Gründer der Stadt'* [n. 11], 63–72; Malkin, *Religion and Colonization* [n. 11], 204–5; E. Cingano, *Encomio e realtà nella Pitica 5 di Pindaro* (Florence, 1990), 29–30. It should also be noted that Battus' tomb in the agora has been identified by S. Stucchi: see S. Stucchi, *L'Agorà di Cirene*, i. *I lati Nord e Est della Platea inferiore* (Rome, 1965), 58–65, and id., *Architettura cirenaica* (Rome, 1975), 12; cf. Malkin, *Religion and Colonization* [n. 11], 214–16; Krummen, *Pyrsos Hymnon* [n. 12], 101; L. Bacchielli, 'I "luoghi" della celebrazione politica e religiosa a Cirene nella poesia di Pindaro e Callimaco', in B. Gentili (ed.), *Cirene: Storia, mito, letteratura* (Atti del Convegno della S.I.S.A.C.—Urbino, 3 luglio 1988; Urbino, 1990), 12–19, who persuasively refutes A. Laronde, *Cyrène et la Libye hellénistique: Libykai historiai* (Paris, 1987), 174–5; and, most recently, L. Bacchielli, 'La tomba di Batto su alcune monete di Cirene', in L. Bacchielli and M. Bonanno Aravantinos (eds.), *Scritti di antichità in memoria di Sandro Stucchi* (2 vols.; Rome, 1996), i. 15–20.

[16] See e.g. F. Chamoux, *Cyrène sous la monarchie des Battiades* (Paris, 1953), 109–11; R. Crahay, *La Littérature oraculaire chez Hérodote* (Paris, 1956), 128–32, 347; J.

no reason, then, to see either the foundation tale or the subsequent 'historical' events as a part of any local history written in prose before Herodotus. Thus, we can safely assume—without prejudicing the interpretation of the general meaning of the *ἐπιχώριοι-Zitate* in Herodotus' work—that *Κυρηναῖοι . . . λέγουσι γὰρ οὕτω* actually implies that oral information about Cyrene's foundation reached Herodotus.

Nevertheless, the relationship between orality and literacy in the tradition of Cyrene's early history deserves to be more accurately defined. Some well-known texts give an account of the origins of Cyrene (and Thera) which probably presupposes both written tradition and oral information (*a–b* below). And a discussion of the oracles mentioned by Herodotus will show that the role of writing cannot be completely excluded (c).

(*a*) *The marriage of Apollo and the nymph Cyrene and the arrival of the Argonauts in Libya*. The myth of Apollo and Cyrene can surely be regarded as a sort of 'primordial creation story' of Cyrene, as I. Malkin aptly called it.[17] As such, it must have been part of the cultural heritage of the Libyan city. There is no need to wonder, then, why Pindar should have celebrated the arrival of Apollo and Cyrene in Libya in his ninth *Pythian*, as it was composed in honour of a Cyrenean athlete.[18] Now, there would be no reason to doubt that Cyrene's genealogy in Pindar has been taken from one of the 'Hesiodic' *Ehoiai*,[19] and it is reasonable to assume that her arrival in Libya was also mentioned there.[20] On the other hand, 'Hesiod'

Fontenrose, *The Delphic Oracle* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1978), 123; H. R. Immerwahr, 'Herodotus', in *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, i. *Greek Literature* (Cambridge, 1985), 426–41 at 429, 431.

[17] Malkin, *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean* [n. 12], 173. The evidence is collected and briefly reviewed by M.-A. Zagdoun, 'Kyrene', in *LIMC* vi/1 (Zurich and Munich, 1992), 167–70. The most relevant texts are: Hes. fr. 215 MW; Pind. *Pyth.* 9; Pherek. *FGrHist* 3 F 58; A.R. 2. 500–10; Call. *h.Ap.* 90–3; Phylarc. *FGrHist* 81 F 16; Ariaithos *FGrHist* 316 F 3; Agroitas *FGrHist* 762 F 1; Akesandros *FGrHist* 469 F 2–4; Mnaseas *FHG* iii. 156 fr. 35; Iustin. 13. 7.

[18] Concerning Pindar's ode, suffice it to cite *Pindaro: Le Pitiche*, ed. B. Gentili, P. Angeli Bernardini, E. Cingano, and P. Giannini (Milan, 1995), lv–lvi, 233 ff., 588 ff.; to the bibliography given at 241–3 add Malkin, *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean* [n. 12], 173–4, and Calame, *Mythe et histoire* [n. 4], 99–109.

[19] Fr. 215 MW ap. Σ Pind. *Pyth.* 9. 6, ii. 221. 12 Drachmann: only the two opening lines are preserved, but cf. the scholiast's statement: *ἀπὸ δὲ Ἠοίας Ἡσιόδου τὴν ἱστορίαν ἔλαβεν ὁ Πίνδαρος*, with M. L. West, *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women* (Oxford, 1985), 85 ff., esp. 87.

[20] So F. Studniczka, *Kyrene: Eine altgriechische Göttin* (Leipzig, 1890), 42, and L.

also celebrated the race of the Argonaut Euphemus and the arrival of the Argonauts in Libya.[21]

It is natural to think that the mainland, 'Hesiodic' poetic tradition had not just invented all these Cyrenean elements. What we know about the Cyrenean poet Eugammon shows that epic poetry was being composed at Cyrene in the sixth century;[22] moreover, there are reasons to infer that Eugammon manipulated the heroic myth in the Battiads' interest.[23] We do not know if a poet of the same school invented the Argonauts' passage through Libya—as West maintains[24]—but it would seem at least possible that long before Pindar's time local Cyrenean poetry had already given written form to the myth of the arrival in Libya both of Cyrene and of the Argonaut ancestor, Euphemus. The 'Hesiodic' tradition, then, would have accepted these Cyrenean elements and Pindar in turn would have been influenced by it. Yet, the fourth *Pythian* shows that Pindar is not simply echoing the ancient poetic tradition. He was

Malten, *Kyrene: Sagengeschichtliche und historische Untersuchungen* (Berlin, 1911), 8–9, who draws attention to the striking coincidence between Pindar's and Pherecydes' accounts both of Cyrene's genealogy and of her arrival in Libya (see *FGrHist* 3 FF 57 and 58); this evidently implies a common source, and we must think of the 'Hesiodic' Cyrene's *Ehoie*. See also West, *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women* [n. 19], 87, emphasizing that the scholiast's statement cited in n. 19 'would hardly have been so formulated if that element had been absent from the Hesiodic poem'.

[21] A learned scholium makes Hesiod bring the Argonauts to Libya: see fr. 241 MW ap. Σ A.R. 4. 259, p. 274 Wendel (*Ἡσίοδος καὶ Πίνδαρος . . . διὰ τοῦ Ὠκεανοῦ φασιν ἐλθεῖν αὐτοὺς εἰς Λιβύην . . .*), with West, *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women* [n. 19], 87; moreover, one of the so-called *Megalai Ehoiai* was the *Ehoie* of Mecionice, Euphemus' mother (fr. 253 MW ap. Σ Pind. *Pyth*. 4. 36c, ii. 102 Drachmann). We do not know if the scholiast is referring exactly to Mecionice's *Ehoie*, as Malten, *Kyrene* [n. 20], 158, and West, *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women*, 27, maintain, but the burden of proof certainly rests with anyone who claims that 'Hesiod' never sang the arrival of the Argonauts in Libya.

[22] For testimonia and fragments of Eugammon see A. Bernabé, *Poetarum Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1987) (*Telegonia*, 100 ff. and xxviii for the relevant literature). The best treatment of his poem is A. Hartmann, *Untersuchungen zur Rekonstruktion der Telegonia des Eugammon von Kyrene*, i. *Die mythographische Überlieferung* (Munich, 1917); a shorter general account is to be found in G. L. Huxley, *Greek Epic Poetry from Eumelos to Panyassis* (London, 1969), 168 ff.; see also, most recently, M. Davies, *The Epic Cycle* (Bristol, 1989), 87–94.

[23] Eugammon gave Odysseus a son Arcesilaus (fr. 3 Bernabé = 2 Davies), obviously in order to connect the royal house with a great epic hero. As G. L. Huxley wrote: 'Since the floruit of Eugammon is given by Eusebius as Olympiad 53.3 [566 BC], the poet probably was active under King Arcesilaus II, and the Arcesilaus of the Telegony was perhaps named after him; possibly Eugammon was his court poet' (see 'Homerica, II: Eugammon', *GRBS* 3 (1960), 17–30 at 24).

[24] West, *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women* [n. 19], 87.

evidently acquainted with local tradition, for he reports a Battiad version.[25] In this case Pindar would have been indebted to a tradition of a very particular kind: 'oral tradition' which presupposed, and probably complemented, written poetical texts.

(*b*) *Mythical genealogies*. Let us now consider Thera's and Cyrene's mythical past as a whole, and its impressive genealogical framework. We have only to recall what Herodotus says about Theras and his genealogy (4. 147. 1–2; 149. 1–2), or about the eight generations which fell between the Phoenician settlement on Calliste/Thera and the arrival of Theras from Sparta with some of the Minyans descended from the Argonauts (145; 147. 4–5).[26] Even more important is the fact that in Pindar's fourth *Pythian* we twice find a calculation by generations.[27]

The critical issue, of course, is whether, and to what extent, writing is presupposed by a genealogical framework of this kind. It is true that in the case of an archaic culture we must not needlessly postulate the existence of written genealogies.[28] As S. Hornblower has rightly pointed out, 'facility with genealogy . . . is characteristic not just of Herodotus . . . but of the oral tradition he inherited'.[29] In this case, however, such striking coincidences are to be found between the texts of Pindar and Herodotus that the existence of an earlier written version of the genealogies of Theras and Euphemus becomes likely.[30] I would not presume to say, however, that Pindar

[25] See also B. K. Braswell, *A Commentary on the* Fourth Pythian Ode *of Pindar* (Berlin and New York, 1988), 89, who very plausibly argues that Pindar must have been acquainted with 'legends which grew up around the Cyrenean royal house'; but he goes too far in denying any written source.

[26] On these traditions see M. Nafissi, 'A proposito degli Aigheidai: Grandi ghene ed emporìa nei rapporti Sparta–Cirene', *AFLP* 18, NS 4 (1980–1), 185–213; P. Vannicelli, 'Gli Egidi e le relazioni tra Sparta e Cirene in età arcaica', *QUCC* 70, NS 41/2 (1992), 55–73; id., *Erodoto e la storia* [n. 4], 126 ff.; and most recently Malkin, *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean* [n. 12], 89–111; nothing relevant is to be found in E. Vandiver, *Herodotus and Heroes: The Interaction of Myth and History* (Frankfurt, 1991). On the vexed question of the eight generations see F. Mitchel, 'Herodotos' Use of Genealogical Chronology', *Phoenix*, 10 (1956), 48–69 at 58 ff.

[27] Battus founded Cyrene 'in the seventeenth generation' (l. 10) and 'in the fourth generation' after Euphemus his *παῖδες* were able to take possession of Libya, after being forced to leave the Peloponnese by the invading Heraclids (ll. 47–9).

[28] The best and most thorough account of Greek genealogies between orality and literature is to be found in R. Thomas, *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens* (Cambridge, 1989), 173–95; see also the sensible remarks of J. Gould, *Herodotus* (London, 1989), 39–40, 46–7.

[29] S. Hornblower (ed.), *Greek Historiography* (Oxford, 1994), 11.

[30] Pindar and Herodotus give to Battus and his remote ancestor Theras the same

and Herodotus drew on a single main source,[31] but it seems most likely that they had the same genealogical material at their disposal. Thus, as far as Thera's origins are concerned, both Pindar and Herodotus give an account in which written tradition and oral information are evidently intertwined.[32]

(*c*) *Oracles and colonial traditions.* We are left with the problem of the nature of the Delphic oracles that feature in the historical traditions of early Cyrene. As is well known, Herodotus repeatedly mentions Cyrenean—and Theran—oracles without quoting their text;[33] other oracles are quoted literally in their metrical form,[34] and in one case we find a prose text still preserving some traces of the original hexameter form.[35] What does this evidence mean? Might we be dealing with Herodotus' handling of oracular written texts which he knew? In fact, the evidence points to a different conclusion.

The Cyrenean oracles quoted, or alluded to, by Herodotus cannot have been picked out from disparate sources, for they would be hardly conceivable independently of the tradition which transmitted them. Nor could they have been drawn from a single written text, for no evidence supports the existence of a 'chresmological poem' on the early history of Cyrene,[36] and the existence of a local written chronicle must remain an unnecessary hypothesis.

place in both of the genealogical sequences, but Herodotus is not drawing on Pindar: the names of Theras' ancestors (4. 147. 1) and a calculation by generations (see 147. 5) that are not in Pindar would not fit in with such a hypothesis.

[31] Studniczka, *Kyrene* [n. 20], 46–7, and C. Robert, *Oidipus: Geschichte eines poetischen Stoffs im griechischen Altertum* (2 vols.; Berlin, 1915), i. 565 ff., maintained that Hecataeus was the common source; see also, most recently, E. Ruschenbusch, 'Eine schriftliche Quelle im Werk Herodots (FGrHist 3 Pherekydes von Athen)', in M. Weinmann-Walser (ed.), *Historische Interpretationen Gerold Walser zum 75. Geburtstag dargebracht von Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern* (Stuttgart, 1995), 131–49, esp. 138–9, who less plausibly suggests that both Pindar and Herodotus depended on Pherecydes.

[32] On this point Jacoby's acute observations are still indispensable (see Jacoby, 'Herodotos' [n. 4], 435, esp. 12–35).

[33] See Hdt. 4. 150. 3 = H. W. Parke and D. E. W. Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle*, ii. *The Oracular Responses* (Oxford, 1956) [henceforth 'PW'], 37; Hdt. 4. 151. 1 = PW 38; Hdt. 4. 155. 4, 156. 1 = PW 40; Hdt. 4. 161. 2 = PW 69; Hdt. 4. 203. 1.

[34] Hdt. 4. 155. 3 = PW 39; Hdt. 4. 157. 2 = PW 41; Hdt. 4. 159. 3 = PW 42.

[35] Hdt. 4. 163. 2 = PW 70, on which see H. Diels, *Parmenides: Lehrgedicht* (Berlin, 1887), 19 ff. ; also A. Oeri, *De Herodoti Fonte Delphico* (diss. Basel, 1899), 27.

[36] For the 'chresmological poem' see A. Schöll, 'Herodots Entwicklung zu seinem Beruf', *Philologus*, 10 (1855), 25–81 at 45–7; an argument along similar lines is also to be found in Studniczka, *Kyrene* [n. 20], 100. As is well known, this view has been laid to rest by Malten, *Kyrene* [n. 20], 196–7.

Now, the Cyrenean oracles appear to be an integral part of the traditions incorporated into Herodotus' work. The foundation legend without the Delphic responses given to Battus, for instance, would hardly be conceivable. The oracles, then, must have been transmitted in the context of a tradition which we ought to regard as an oral one.[37] Thus, it was probably this living tradition that quoted the oracles in different forms, from literal citation to the most general summary. Why should Herodotus have retold in prose or even summarized only a few of the oracles which had reached him? Moreover, one might suspect that there had once been more oracular texts in verse than we find in Herodotus.[38] If this is so, it was the oral tradition that selected and reproduced only some of the oracular texts. Now, one might wonder whether both the quotation in different forms and the selection of the oracles by the oral tradition would not better fit with the existence of a collection of Delphic oracles concerning the history of the city. A collection of oracles existed at Sparta and at Pisistratid Athens,[39] and this might suggest that the Battiads collected the oracles they were interested in. A passage in Clement of Alexandria seems to point in the same direction.[40]

[37] A point already made by F. Benedict, *De Oraculis ab Herodoto Commemoratis Quaestionum Pars Prior* (diss. Bonn, 1871), 35, and Malten, *Kyrene* [n. 20], 198: 'Dem Herodot wurden die Orakeln von seinen kyrenäischen Gewährsmännern im Zusammenhang ihrer Berichte über die älteste Geschichte der Stadt mitgeteilt'.

[38] e.g. Hdt. 4. 150. 3 = PW 37; Hdt. 4. 151. 1 = PW 38; Hdt. 4. 156. 1 = PW 40; Hdt. 4. 161. 2 = PW 69; Hdt. 4. 163. 2 = PW 70; it should also be noted that D.S. 8. 29 (an extended version of the oracle quoted by Herodotus at 4. 155. 3 = PW 39) could well go back to the (late?) archaic age, as its emphasis on the Battiads' dynasty seems to suggest.

[39] See Hdt. 5. 90. 2: *ἐκτήσατο δὲ ὁ Κλεομένης ἐκ τῆς Ἀθηναίων ἀκροπόλιος τοὺς χρησμούς, τοὺς ἔκτηντο μὲν πρότερον οἱ Πεισιστρατίδαι, ἐξελαυνόμενοι δὲ ἔλιπον ἐν τῷ ἱρῷ· καταλειφθέντας δὲ ὁ Κλεομένης ἀνέλαβε*. As for Sparta, see Hdt. 6. 57. 4 *τὰς δὲ μαντηίας τὰς γινομένας τούτους* [sc. *τοὺς βασιλέας*] *φυλάσσειν, συνειδέναι δὲ καὶ τοὺς Πυθίους*, which 'must mean that the kings kept an archive . . . that preserved oracles' (J. A. S. Evans, *Herodotus, Explorer of the Past: Three Essays* (Princeton, 1991), 124). Any thorough treatment of the oracular collections of the Greek poleis should start from Fontenrose, *The Delphic Oracle* [n. 16], 164–5.

[40] See *Strom*. 1. 21. 133. 1 (82. 20–1 Stählin) *φασὶ δὲ τὴν Μόψου καλουμένην μαντικὴν συντάξαι τὸν Κυρναῖον Βάττον*. This passage, which is an integral part of a noteworthy section on Greek *χρησμολόγοι* borrowed *en bloc* from a learned source, is best regarded as a fragment of a certain Dorotheos, probably a grammarian of the Augustan/Tiberian age who is mentioned immediately afterwards (see *FGrHist* 145 F 4, with the remarks in *FGrHist* IIIa, 389–90). We are thus dealing with a piece of learning not to be rejected on a priori grounds: E. Hiller, 'Zur Quellenkritik des Clemens Alexandrinus', *Hermes*, 21 (1886), 126–33, was over-sceptical and was persuasively refuted by Jacoby (see F. Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarchs *Parallela*

To sum up. Perhaps writing is not to be excluded from the role played by the oracles in the reconstruction of Cyrene's past. Probably under the Battiads' rule, a collection was made of oracular texts relating to the history of the city, but later additions would always have remained possible. Moreover, we should think of these oracles as circulating. It is these oracular texts that would have been quoted, summarized, or hinted at by the oral tradition, especially in the later stages of its development and transmission. I would surmise that Herodotus was dealing with a sort of 'semi-oral' tradition, which in turn presupposed a collection of oracular texts.

All the cases we have been discussing so far—the myths of Apollo and the nymph Cyrene and of the Argonauts in Libya, the genealogical tradition concerning the origins of Thera, the oracles about Cyrene's foundation and early history—show that oral and written methods of communication could well have existed side by side within the context of archaic Cyrenean society. But there is more to it than that. It would seem that some written texts—epic poems, oracular collections, perhaps genealogical works in prose—were echoed, complemented, or even manipulated by oral forms of communication and transmission. As a consequence, we have to think not only of a complex interplay between written texts and 'oral' traditions, but also of a semi-oral tradition.

2.2. *'Traditional' narratives?*

Oral traditions do tend to adjust themselves to contemporary circumstances. Vansina's well-known criticism of Goody does not call this into question.[41] Nevertheless, we should ask to what extent homoeostasis is a fully appropriate concept to describe the way oral traditions work. In fact, Goody's 'hidden analogy of societies to organisms' and 'the claim that culture is totally homogeneous in an

minora und die Schwindelautoren', *Mnemosyne*[3], 8 (1940), 73–144 at 95–6 and nn. 88–9 = *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtsschreibung*, ed. H. Bloch (Leiden, 1956), 359–422 at 378–9). The passage is admittedly puzzling, but it possibly refers to a compilation of oracles kept by a Battiad king (see Studniczka, *Kyrene* [n. 20], 100, and L. Pareti, *Storia di Sparta arcaica* (Florence, 1917), 239 n. 5, who thinks it is Battus IV) and made in the name of a legendary seer: in this case Mopsus, the Argonauts' seer (Pind. *Pyth.* 4. 189–90), who died in Libya (A.R. 4. 1500 ff. ; Lyc. 881, with C. Robert, *Die griechische Heldensage*, ii. *Die Argonauten: Der thebanische Kreis*, 4th edn. (Berlin, 1921) 775–7).

[41] Vansina, *Oral Tradition as History* [n. 1], 120–3.

oral society' are untenable.[42] Vansina denied that traditions could be perfectly congruent with society and maintained that 'beyond homeostasis fundamental cultural options, differing worldviews must be taken into account and they are not wholly conditioned by the present social organization'.[43] The critical issue, then, is to what extent the traditions of the past are congruent with the concerns of the present.

As for Cyrene, it is essential to raise this point in connection with the particular kind of traditions we have been discussing so far. To what extent are they to be seen as 'traditional'? And what role is played by the homoeostatic processes?

The Cyrenean traditions concerning Battus are a good test case. Let us compare Pindar and Herodotus. In between, as is well known, the fall of the Battiads occurred,[44] and Herodotus evidently takes this into account. His Cyrenean tradition (4. 154–6) reflects a change in the political climate and has assumed a form which suits the situation at the moment when it was last recreated and handed down. In this tradition, while the initiative of the Delphic Apollo is still emphasized, as it is in Pindar,[45] Battus' link with all the Argonautic and Minyan background is completely missing.[46] The emphasis on Battus' royal status, so strong in Pindar's Cyrenean odes,[47] is also missing in Herodotus.[48] Moreover, Herodotus apparently ignores the Delphic sanctioning of the Battiad dynasty,

[42] The quotations are from Vansina, ibid. 122 and 120. [43] Ibid. 122.

[44] Chamoux's low date of 439 BC for the fall of the Battiads (*Cyrène sous la monarchie des Battiades* [n. 16], 109–11) rests on what seem to me not quite adequate grounds; B. M. Mitchell, 'Cyrene and Persia', *JHS* 86 (1966), 99–113, esp. 110–12, is convincing. I would not rule out the possibility that before 454 BC the Egyptian revolt from Persia made it easier for the Cyreneans to free themselves from the 'Medizing' Battiads (see Studniczka, *Kyrene* [n. 20], 100; Mitchell, op. cit. 112; S. Hornblower, *The Greek World, 479–323 BC*, 2nd edn. (London and New York, 1991), 61).

[45] *Pyth.* 4. 5–8, 53–6, and above all 59–60; see also 259–60 and *Pyth.* 5. 60–2.

[46] Battus is not represented as the hero destined to fulfil the old prophecies, as he is in Pindar (*Pyth.* 4. 5–11), nor is he Euphemides, as in the Theran version (Hdt. 4. 150. 2 and again in Pind. *Pyth.* 4. 44–53).

[47] See 4. 53, 62; 5. 62.

[48] What Herodotus says in 4. 155. 2–3 about the meaning of the founder's name (Battus = king) is not part of the 'Cyrenean version' as such; as Pasquali has already very suitably remarked, 'È chiaro dal contesto che Erodoto polemizza qui contro una tradizione la quale spiegava altrimenti il nome di Batto, che la sua è non tradizione, ma correzione razionalistica' (G. Pasquali, 'Ancora Cirene mitica', *SIFC* 21 (1915), 480–1). See also Pareti's discussion, *Storia di Sparta arcaica* [n. 40], 238–9); Chamoux, *Cyrène sous la monarchie des Battiades* [n. 16], 97–8, is inadequate.

through the special relationship of the founder with Apollo, which is a fundamental part of Pindar's euology of Arcesilaus.[49] It becomes apparent that the Cyrenean tradition reported by Herodotus presupposes the Battiads' fall and dispenses with all the essential elements of the image of its own past which the royal house wished to establish.

Let us now shift our point of view for a moment. We have recognized Cyrene's special relationship with Apollo, through the figure of the founder, as being at the core of the city's collective identity. It must be a very early creation. As time passed, the Delphic connection fulfilled many different functions and it was shaped in more than one way. It played a historical role in the course of the sixth century;[50] later on, Arcesilaus IV must have strongly emphasized it and adapted it to the needs of the Battiads' court: essentially a strong Delphic legitimation of the monarchy; finally, in the time of the republican regime, it took the shape that is found in Herodotus. It is evident that in all these cases the idea of a special relationship between Cyrene and Delphi had to be articulated in different ways. Constant restructuring is necessarily implied.

One can advance some conclusions. The examples of colonial narrative we have been briefly looking at turn out to be tools employed by the community in the construction of a symbolically significant past and in the shaping of its collective identity. They become established as traditions and are transmitted as such, but homoeostasis is at work. Nevertheless, not every traditional element adjusts itself to the contemporary situation. Invention of the past, historical memories, and homoeostatic dynamics seem to be closely intertwined.

[49] On Delphic sanctioning of Battus' and his descendants' kingship in Pindar's Cyrenean odes see P. Giannini, 'Interpretazione della Pitica 4 di Pindaro', *QUCC* 31 (1979), 35–63, esp. 37 (and n. 12, with literature), 39 ff.; Cingano, *Encomio e realtà nella Pitica 5 di Pindaro* [n. 15], 44–5 (esp. n. 108); Braswell, *A Commentary on the* Fourth Pythian Ode *of Pindar* [n. 25], 141 and *passim*; *Pindaro: Le Pitiche*, ed. Gentili *et al*. [n. 18], lx–lxi, 164.

[50] Under Battus II (see Hdt. 4. 152. 2–3) and at the time of Demonax (see Hdt. 4. 161); on the historical context see now A. Jähne, 'Land und Gesellschaft in Kyrenes Frühzeit (7.–6. Jahrhundert v.u.Z.)', *Klio*, 70 (1988), 145–66; K.-J. Hölkeskamp, 'Demonax und die Neuordnung der Bürgerschaft von Kyrene', *Hermes*, 121 (1993), 406–21; U. Walter, *An der Polis teilhaben: Bürgerstaat und Zugehörigkeit im archaischen Griechenland* (Stuttgart, 1993), 145–9.

2.3. *Local' traditions as epichoric traditions?*

Thus far we have discussed a body of different colonial traditions which more or less directly correspond to local situations. They are usually called 'local traditions'. But what exactly does this mean? Are we dealing, for instance, with epichoric traditions, unknown or not circulating outside a single given community? Should we rule out the possibility that the 'local' tradition of a great Mediterranean polis has been shaped, at least in part, by contact with other communities or panhellenic centres? Let us turn once more, with these questions in mind, to Thera and Cyrene.

As we have already said, it is very likely that, in one of the 'Hesiodic' *Ehoiai*, Apollo and the nymph Cyrene landed in Libya. Now, it deserves to be underlined that this myth is alluded to in a Delphic response to Battus which forms an integral part of the foundation tale.[51] Thus, 'panhellenic' poetry and local tradition seem to have existed side by side. Perhaps the latter influenced the former.

Furthermore, when we find the Argonauts in Libya in the genealogical poetry of 'Hesiod', we must conclude that this is a piece of Cyrenean mythology incorporated into the mainland poetic tradition.[52] And the situation is not different in the case of the genealogies of Theras and Euphemus. We ought to assume both local genealogical traditions and genealogical works written in other areas of the Greek world. Nor, perhaps, should it be excluded that the former were acquainted with the latter.

To revert once more to the Delphic oracles concerning Cyrene's early history, what is most relevant is that some of them show traces of Doric dialect.[53] And it is worth noting that the word *οἰκιστήρ*, which occurs in another oracular text and in the 'Oath of the Settlers',[54] turns out to be an official term at Cyrene.[55] We

[51] Hdt. 4. 157. 2 = PW 42 *αἰ τὸ ἐμεῦ Λιβύην μηλοτρόφον οἴδας ἄμεινον, | μὴ ἐλθὼν ἐλθόντος, ἄγαν ἄγαμαι σοφίην σευ*: 'es ganz deutlich auf den oftbesungenen Aufenthalt Apollons und der Nymphe Kyrene in Libyen Bezug nimmt': K. O. Müller, *Orchomenos und die Minyer*, 2nd edn. (Breslau, 1844), 339.

[52] See West, *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women* [n. 19], 87.

[53] See Hdt. 4. 155. 1 = PW 39; Hdt. 4. 157. 2 = PW 41; Hdt. 4. 159. 3 = PW 42.

[54] See Hdt. 4. 155. 3 = PW 39. 1. 2, and ML no. 5. 22; the word occurs also in Call. *h. Ap.* 67.

[55] Perhaps 'der staats- und religionsrechtliche Ausdruck der Stadt', as Pasquali put it: see G. Pasquali, '*Οἰκιστήρ*', *Glotta*, 5 (1914), 197–202, repr. in *Scritti filologici* (2 vols.; Florence, 1986), i. 585–9 (for the quotation see 201 = 588); see now the sensible remarks of L. Lehnus, 'Antichità cirenaiche in Callimaco', *Eikasmos*, 5 (1994), 189–207 at 191–2 and nn. 22–8, 196–7 and nn. 48–50.

could argue, then, that these linguistic features bear witness to the influence of the local context on the Delphic oracles at issue. It is perhaps within the priestly milieu associated with the civic cult of Apollo that we must look for the custodians and interpreters of the special relationship between Cyrene and Delphi. Nor should one rule out the possibility of contacts on a personal level, too.[56] We could suggest that we are dealing with a series of oracles which have been conceived within a tight network of cultural and personal relations between Cyrene and Delphi.

I would not deny, however, the existence of Delphic traditions. Oswyn Murray has persuasively argued that a narrative tradition in prose which employed oracles and emphasized the role of the oracle was probably based at Delphi.[57] It usually centred around characters with heroic traits and showed a pronounced taste for stories with folklore components. From this point of view, the Cyrenean version of the foundation legend reported by Herodotus could be viewed as a Delphic tradition. But is there any reason to believe that only the Delphic priests were responsible for the main lines of this tradition? The Cyrenean version is an oracular tale which not only is an integral part of the heroic legend of the founder, but also claims—by stressing Cyrene's Delphic connection—a special cultural quality for the community. As far as the origin and

[56] In this connection attention should be drawn to the presence at Cyrene of a certain Onymastus from Delphi, to whom a tomb is assigned in the 'cathartic law' with the same religious privileges enjoyed by that of Battus. The law is *SEG* ix. 72 (cf. xx. 717)=Sokolowski, *LSS* no. 115 (but see the literature briefly discussed by R. Parker, *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion* (Oxford, 1983), 332–3); the document can be dated to about 300 BC, but 'the rules it contains are doubtless very various in date' (Parker, 334). For Onymastus see lines 22–3, which are part of a much-discussed section (lines 21–5) on which Parker (336–9) is fundamental; add now C. Dobias-Lalou, 'Le cinquième commandement de la loi sacrée de Cyrène', in Bacchielli and Bonanno Aravantinos (eds.), *Scritti di antichità in memoria di Sandro Stucchi* [n. 15], i. 73–8. On the Delphic Onymastus see esp. G. De Sanctis, 'Le decretali di Cirene', in *Scritti minori*, iv (Rome, 1976), 281–306 at 287; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, 'Heilige Gesetze: Eine Urkunde aus Kyrene', *SPAW* 19 (1927), 155–76 at 173; K. Latte, 'Orakel', *RE* xviii/1 (1939), 829–66, esp. 844 ff.; Chamoux, *Cyrène sous la monarchie des Battiades* [n. 16], 132, 285–7; S. Mazzarino, *Fra Oriente e Occidente*, 2nd edn. (Milan, 1989), 316; Leschhorn, *'Gründer der Stadt'* [n. 11], 68; Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece* [n. 11], 210; Lehnus, 'Antichità cirenaiche in Callimaco', 194–5. Was this Onymastus perhaps an envoy of the Pythian sanctuary, who after death was granted a special religious status by the city?

[57] Murray, *Early Greece* [n. 14], 105–7; H. I. Flower, 'Herodotus and the Delphic Traditions about Croesus', in M. A. Flower and M. Toher (eds.), *Georgica: Greek Studies in Honour of George Cawkwell* (London, 1991), 57–77, is also noteworthy.

transmission of this tradition are concerned, then, the Cyrenean context must have played an important role. The linguistic features of the oracles encourage the same conclusion. On the other hand, the Delphic traits of the tradition are so marked that we cannot conceive of them as independent from the network of relations existing between Cyrene and Delphi. It would not be wise in this case to draw a sharp distinction between local context and Delphic influence. Colonial traditions were not something set apart from the Greek world.

Before proceeding further, it may be helpful to recall in summary form the main points of this section:

(*a*) Colonies had stories concerning their own origins; but the existence of 'official versions', unchallenged by variants and vested with undisputed authority, remains very doubtful. The Cyrenean evidence surely points to this conclusion and leads us to imagine several themes embodied in a variety of different narratives.[58] Both a unified memory and an organized transmission of the tradition should be ruled out.

(*b*) The examples of colonial narrative we have been looking at demonstrate that historical memory and homoeostatic dynamics are closely intertwined. Historical materials are undoubtedly employed in the construction of a culturally significant past, but at the same time the actualities of the present exert a strong influence on the form and content of the tradition. The fall of the Battiads is a case in point. The relationship between Cyrene and Delphi in the course of the sixth and fifth centuries BC is another.

(*c*) As for the oral or literate nature of the traditions at issue, I have argued that we are not dealing with 'uncontaminated' oral traditions. It would appear that some written texts were echoed, complemented, or even manipulated by oral forms of communication and transmission. Thus, we should think of a semi-oral tradition.

(*d*) The phrase 'local tradition' turns out to be a rather vague one. The Cyrenean evidence warns us to consider that local tradition does not necessarily mean epichoric tradition in a strict sense. We are dealing, in fact, with traditions circulating outside the local context: for instance, pieces of Cyrenean mythology incorporated into mainland poetic tradition, or traditions which make use of material already existing in writing. And it is in the light of the

[58] As Calame, *Mythe et histoire* [n. 4], 65–6, has very sensibly remarked.

relationship between Cyrene and the Delphic panhellenic sanctuary that the Cyrenean oracles reported by Herodotus ought to be viewed.

3. *From 'Local' Traditions to Historiography? Herodotus at Work*

So far I have been discussing colonial narratives which are usually labelled as 'oral local tradition'. We have already seen that qualification is needed, but one can safely assume that such narratives were to a large extent part of Cyrene's cultural heritage. We should probably turn our attention, at this point, to the relationship between the local Cyrenean tradition and 'great historiography'—that is to say, in this case, Herodotus. It is Herodotus, in fact, who claims to be reporting Theran and Cyrenean traditions. But what exactly does this mean? What memories and narratives was he indebted to? And how did he gather his information? How to reconcile, moreover, the historian's active role as a builder of his own text, and the existence of traditions he feels compelled to report? As Arnaldo Momigliano once said in discussing Herodotus' successful use of oral traditions, 'the secrets of his workshop are not yet all out'.[59] It is obviously a crucial question, but it cannot be discussed here with the fullness it deserves. I confine myself to a few remarks.

The notion that Herodotus should have 'lifted' ready-made local λόγοι, with a consolidated narrative shape, and contented himself with putting them together, was convincingly denounced as a *petitio principii* by Felix Jacoby.[60] We may add that every approach of this kind necessarily underestimates the textual quality of Herodotus' work. The high conceptual sophistication of his narrative, its literary coherence, and its overall meaning cannot be put aside. Nevertheless, 'great historiography' is widely believed to have preserved Greek local tradition from oblivion and 'turned local memory into universal narrative'.[61] In some sense this is surely true. Herodotus' achievement lies precisely in the construction of his text, and in the

[59] A. Momigliano, 'The Place of Herodotus in the History of Historiography', *History*, 18 (1958), 1–13 at 3–4, repr. in *Secondo contributo alla storia degli studi classici* (Rome, 1984), 29–44 at 32.

[60] See Jacoby, 'Herodotos' [n. 4], 407. 39 ff.

[61] Gould, *Herodotus* [n. 31], 38.

choice to present the results of his enquiry in narrative form. But determining what kind of materials Herodotus was dealing with when he gathered his information is anything but easy. It is surely misleading to assume that local traditions were simply a sort of small-scale historical account which Herodotus had only to fit into his narrative. This supposition would lead us not only to misunderstand the workings of oral tradition, but also to misread Herodotus himself. It seems clear to me that the nature of Greek local traditions in Herodotus needs to be reconsidered, all the more so as it is far from clear how the historian became acquainted with local traditions, especially in the case of the Greek cities.

Some scholars emphasize the analogy between Herodotus and the modern anthropologist working in the field. Both are often regarded as recorders of oral traditions.[62] But even assuming that Herodotus was the last link in the transmission chain, the one where the tradition found at last a stable shape in written form, we cannot simply think of traditions which were, so to speak, ready to be recorded. For anthropology itself suggests some methodological caution. One should especially avoid underestimating the impact of any 'recording situation' on the character and the organization of the information transmitted.[63] Indeed, it seems to me that we cannot take for granted even the concept itself of 'recording situation'. The evidence points to a different conclusion. We should not necessarily think that Herodotus gathered all his information at once. We can safely assume that he 'inquired, thought a bit, inquired some more, then thought some more'.[64] Moreover, we should consider that the transmission of the information is best situated, as we shall see, in the context of a social and cultural relationship which was bound to affect the shape and content of the 'traditions'.

We may now make an attempt at understanding the making of a typical example of Herodotean 'local tradition' and, as a consequence, the interplay of reality and representation in Herodotus' *historiē*. The Cyrenean version of the foundation legend reported as such by Herodotus is taken here as a test case.

A comparison of the Theran and Cyrenean versions reported by Herodotus with the tradition reflected and interpreted by Pin-

[62] On Herodotus as a 'field worker' see above all Evans, *Herodotus* [n. 39], 132 ff., 142–3.

[63] See Vansina, *Oral Tradition as History* [n. 1], 59–62.

[64] R. L. Fowler, 'Herodotos and his Contemporaries', *JHS* 116 (1996), 69–87 at 85 n. 149.

dar is illuminating. Not more than a couple of decades before Herodotus,[65] an apparently unified tradition flourished at the Battiads' court. If we keep in mind the local variants mentioned in Herodotus' text, Pindar's fourth and fifth *Pythians* allow us to recognize Theran as well as Cyrenean elements. The detail of Battus' stutter we read of in Pindar (*Pyth.* 4. 63) fits in perfectly with the Cyrenean tradition reported by Herodotus (4. 155. 1, 3). The same is true of the emphasis on the role of the Delphic oracle and Battus' special relationship with Apollo (*Pyth.* 4. 3–6; 53 ff., 60; Hdt. 4. 155. 3–156). Among the features which characterize the Theran tradition found in the *Pythian Odes* are the harmonious relationship between colony and mother city (*Pyth.* 4. esp. 6–11, 19–20; 5. 75 ff.), the emphasis on Battus' descent from the Argonauts and Euphemus (*Pyth.* 4, esp. 9–10, 256 ff.), and in general the setting of Cyrene's origins in a mythical-genealogical past going back to the Argonauts by way of Sparta and Thera (*Pyth.* 4. 256 ff.; 5. 73 ff.).

In the light of these remarks, what should we think of the Theran and Cyrenean traditions as presented by Herodotus? We evidently cannot maintain that these traditions did not exist as such, or that they had no 'social surface'. Of the arguments against this conclusion, the strongest is surely the fact that the texts which reflect these traditions presuppose a local 'reaction' to the fall of the Battiad dynasty. And if these traditions were significant for the local community—otherwise they would not have been modified—they must have been the product of social dynamics and therefore have a 'social surface'. And yet, the 'local' variants we read—that is to say, the Theran and Cyrenean versions of the foundation legend—cannot be what was handed down through generations: they cannot, in other words, be earlier than Cyrene's new republican regime. If this is so, we cannot think of two different 'local' narratives dating back to the sixth century, whose contents Pindaric poetry blurred and Herodotus' enquiry recovered later on.

How to reconcile, then, the traditional elements to be found in the narratives of Cyrene's origins and the post-Battiad chronology of the Theran and Cyrenean versions, at least as we read them in

[65] Jacoby, 'Herodotos' [n. 4], 253–5, remains the most thorough discussion of the vexed question of Herodotus' visit to Cyrene; there are sufficient reasons to assume that it actually occurred (see 253. 24–5), although the chronology must remain uncertain (Jacoby tends to put it at the end of the 440s). Chamoux, *Cyrène sous la monarchie des Battiades* [n. 16], 153–6, and Corcella, *Erodoto: Le Storie*, iv [n. 4], xxxi, are over-sceptical.

Herodotus? We can perhaps suggest an explanation. In the form it assumes in Pindar, the tradition is part of the ideology of the Battiads' monarchy. With the fall of the monarchy, this tradition does, in some sense, disintegrate and probably does not come together again as an 'official' tradition of the new regime. It emerges instead as a plurality of narrations: folk tales, legends linked to the founder's cult, oral traditions, oracular traditions, genealogical traditions. Different social and cultural milieux, individuals, and groups, and different civic contexts, must have preferred this or that aspect of this cluster of traditions concerning the origins of the city. The κτίσις itself must have assumed different forms. Remaining conspicuously in the forefront are 'traditionalist' elements from the Therans on one side and elements of the heroic legend of Battus on the other, including the relationship with Delphic Apollo, which Cyrenean priestly groups would have continued to emphasize, although with no dynastic implications. We find these elements, in corresponding order, in the 'Theran version' of Cyrene's foundation legend and in the 'Cyrenean' one. We must imagine, then, that at Cyrene Herodotus did not find a single oral tradition that was anonymous, collective, and officially sanctioned by the entire community. One wonders whether Herodotus' way of handling a cluster of elements, more or less organized from the narrative point of view, may not be the product of some interaction between the historian and the people who provided him with information.

The transmission of information which we can imagine is in fact a relationship between different sides, a social process involving a degree of adjustment between the point of view of the informants and the content of the information transmitted on the one hand, and the historian, his point of view, and the information he already has, on the other. Herodotean enquiry, then, as a catalyst of the tradition? From this perspective Herodotus' text presupposes a kind of combined effort on the part of both the historian and his informants; but in its final form, which is what we have, this work is only dimly visible, filtered through the shape imposed on it by the author.

We can now draw some conclusions. The crucial question, of course, is the meaning of statements like 'the Cyreneans say', the so-called ἐπιχώριοι-*Zitate*.[66] If my arguments are sound, we have to

[66] N. Luraghi's paper in this volume is the most recent and sensible treatment of this topic.

give up the idea—at least as far as the Cyrenean case is concerned—that such statements necessarily imply the existence of official traditions shared by the whole community and vested with undisputed authority, or guarantee that the historian has recorded a traditional tale informally current in a particular local context. Moreover, there is no real reason to draw a sharp distinction between information gathered from individuals and anonymous and 'collective' traditions.[67] The point is that, when Herodotus reports local knowledge, explicitly attributing it to the locals, he is not stating how he actually gathered his information, nor is he quoting his sources in a formal sense. I would surmise that Herodotus is giving a sort of summary reference, succinctly conveying his conception of the nature and the fundamental origin of the information he had at his disposal. It is apparent that what matters to Herodotus is the local nature of his information, not his individual informants. He tends to think of local information as a tradition, and a unitary one, and to represent it as collective. This evidently means crediting a community with a tradition and taking it for granted that such a tradition had a social dimension, or a 'social surface'. All this surely implies a certain amount of guesswork and is even compatible with Fehling's principle of 'the obvious source'.[68] Although Herodotus surely did not invent the very content of the information he gives in his text, he used what he had at his disposal to construct narratives that appear more coherent and detailed than any tradition the *ἐπιχώριοι* ever kept. And yet, 'the idea of the past as a shared possession' was not only typical of Herodotus,[69] but also of Greek polis culture, for it was intimately connected with the role played by the past in a community's self-definition. Thus, Herodotus probably recognized and stressed what actually mattered to the community as a whole, even if he was dealing with traditions handed down by restricted groups or individuals. After all, he must have been a good judge of Greek attitudes towards the past.

[67] On this point I cannot follow Gould, *Herodotus* [n. 28], 28–9.

[68] See D. Fehling, *Herodotus and his 'Sources': Citation, Invention and Narrative Art* (Leeds, 1989), 12–14, 88–93, 95–104, and *passim*. Needless to say, the *ἐπιχώριοι-Zitate* in the Cyrenean *λόγος* are explained by Fehling in the light of the 'usual principle of considering who can be supposed to know what' (see 91–2).

[69] For the quotation see Luraghi in this volume (pp. 149–50).

7

Local Knowledge in Herodotus' *Histories*

NINO LURAGHI

'Bei wenigen alten Historikern ist die Quellenkritik so leicht, bei wenigen so unerlässlich wie bei Herodot.'[1] In the light of the endless number of works that have appeared in the century that has passed since von Gutschmid wrote these words, reading them today may make one think that the circular movement of classical studies displays some tragic irony. But that is not the reason why I mention them. In the present study I shall try to argue that the presuppositions lying behind von Gutschmid's statement have produced a substantial misunderstanding of Herodotus' methods and aims.

In fact, the reason why von Gutschmid thought of Herodotus as an author easy to scrutinize in terms of source criticism is quite obvious: in his work sentences such as 'the people from Borysthenes say they are Milesians' (4. 78. 3) appear dozens of times, and it is not surprising that in the nineteenth century scholars interpreted those statements in the framework of their own technical language and construed them as source references. Yet the idea that Herodotus by interspersing his account with such statements simply intended to quote his sources, as any good positivist historian should, soon began to cause problems. Diels argued in 1887 that much of what Herodotus says, particularly but not only in book 2, might already have appeared in the work of Hecataeus;[2] and although Diels was not willing to accuse Herodotus of plagiarism, there is evident

[1] 'With few ancient historians is source criticism so easy, with few so necessary, as with Herodotus': A. von Gutschmid, 'Über Schuberts Geschichte der Könige von Lydien', *Göttinger gelehrte Anzeigen* (1885: 6), 233–8 at 235, repr. in id., *Kleine Schriften*, iii (Leipzig, 1892), 473–9 at 476.

[2] H. Diels, 'Herodot und Hekataios', *Hermes*, 22 (1887), 411–44.

uneasiness in his contention that every time Herodotus says 'the Egyptians say' and then gives information strongly suspected of stemming from Hecataeus, he has just lifted the source reference together with the rest from his predecessor. An improved version of Diels's acquittal of Herodotus was worked out by Jacoby. According to the latter, Herodotus does not quote Hecataeus when he takes information from him which he feels to be right or which concerns things he has seen himself. However, generally speaking, when quoting at all, Herodotus would not quote the Greek author who had seen and written of the things before him, but rather the original sources—the locals—no matter whether they had already been quoted by the written source or just questioned by Herodotus in order to check that source.[3]

What emerges clearly from this somewhat clumsy argument is Jacoby's uneasiness with the possibility that Herodotus was baldly attributing to the Egyptians or to other locals what he had actually read in some written source, e.g. Hecataeus. Jacoby's rather complicated reconstruction is a good example of the wish of modern scholars to see Herodotus as a colleague, without wanting to recognize him as a lazy and untrustworthy one. It comes as no surprise that time and again someone will take just the opposite view and maintain that all of Herodotus' source references were imaginary. In its severest version, represented most recently by Detlev Fehling,[4] and by Plutarch long before him,[5] this sceptical position also maintains that Herodotus actually invented most of the contents of his work, and particularly the pieces of information for which he gave source references. I should add that the tendentiousness which is as obvious in Fehling as it is in Plutarch renders them doomed losers against the charm of the father of history.

Nevertheless, I feel that Fehling's book enables us to gain some precious insights into Herodotus' method. His claims about the objective untruthfulness of what Herodotus puts into other people's mouths have been attacked from many sides, and Fehling's ten-

[3] F. Jacoby, 'Über die Entwicklung der griechischen Historiographie und den Plan einer neuen Sammlung der griechischen Historikerfragmente', *Klio*, 9 (1909), 80–123 at 112 n. 95, repr. in *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtsschreibung*, ed. H. Bloch (Leiden, 1956), 16–64 at 51 n. 95; and more fully id., 'Hekataios von Milet', *RE* vii/2 (1912), 2667–750 at 2676. A similar position e.g. in *Hérodote: Histoires*, ed. Ph.-E. Legrand, i. *Introduction* (Paris, 1932), 59–60.

[4] *Herodotus and his 'Sources': Citation, Invention and Narrative Art*, trans. J. G. Howie (Leeds, 1989), a thoroughly revised version of *Die Quellenangaben bei Herodot* (Berlin and New York, 1971).

[5] Plut. *De Her. mal.* 40.

dency to operate with a quite unsophisticated concept of historical truth and to measure Herodotus by the standards of nineteenth-century historiography vitiates his analysis from beginning to end.[6] On the other hand, critics of Fehling have understandably concentrated on the question of Herodotus' objective truthfulness. The rules which, according to Fehling, Herodotus would apply in forging his source references have received markedly less attention.[7] Keeping the problem of the logic behind the source references separate from that of the truthfulness of their contents, I shall try to argue that some of Fehling's rules—those which he calls the 'principle of citing the obvious source' and the 'principle of respect for party bias'—are basically sound.[8] In fact the first and most important of them had been recognized also by Jacoby, who, however, failed to emphasize its relevance.[9]

One reason why the logic underpinning Herodotus' source references has not been widely recognized is that it becomes evident only if one looks at them all.[10] Sparing the reader an analysis of the whole of the *Histories*, I shall show in the following what conclusions may be drawn from such an analysis as regards the nature and meaning of Herodotus' source references. In doing this, I shall take the viewpoint of the speakers rather than that of the enquirer, so to speak, in order to show clearly the geographical structure of these references. This means that I shall not treat the cases in which Herodotus simply says what other people recount as essentially distinct from those in which he specifies that he has personally been told something somewhere by someone. For my purpose the pos-

[6] The standard work of reference for the anti-Fehling line is W. K. Pritchett, *The Liar School of Herodotus* (Amsterdam, 1993), which is an essential companion to Fehling's book. For further objections see also H. Erbse, 'Fiktion und Wahrheit im Werke Herodots', *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse* (1991), 131–50, and R. L. Fowler, 'Herodotos and his Contemporaries', *JHS* 116 (1996), 62–87 at 80–5. For my own position see 'Erodoto tra storia e fantasia', *QS* 40 (1994), 181–9.

[7] This is true of Pritchett's book (see the preceding note). Cf. now appendix 1, by G. Shrimpton and K. M. Gillis, to G. Shrimpton, *History and Memory in Ancient Greece* (Montreal, 1997), 229–65.

[8] Provided that one takes the so-called source references for what they are—that is, *not* source references. See below.

[9] Jacoby, 'Herodotos', *RE* suppl. ii (1913), 205–520 at 401.

[10] Lists of Herodotean source references, compiled according to different criteria, are to be found in von Gutschmid, 'Index Fontium Herodoti', *Kleine Schriften*, iv (Leipzig, 1893), 145–82; Jacoby, 'Herodotos' [n. 9], 398–9; and now in Shrimpton, *History and Memory* [n. 7], 249–65. None of them is a substitute for direct and extensive reading of the *Histories*.

sible biographical implications of these statements are irrelevant: it does not matter here if Herodotus ever spoke to an Egyptian priest; what does matter is why he says that he spoke with Egyptian priests and not, for instance, with some Samian tradesman. This does not amount to saying that I see no difference between the two kinds of source references: the generic, and those implying personal communication. At first sight, in fact, separating statements of personal contact with the informant(s) from generic hearsay sounds quite sensible, but in practice it seems to me nearly impossible to draw a clear line dividing the two sorts of references without producing ambiguous cases. The variety of nuances defies any classification. Perhaps, then, the statements of direct contact with informants should not be overemphasized and singled out, particularly because Herodotus himself does not always seem to attach much importance to the difference, as some examples show: the people of Chemmis at first speak generically, then answer Herodotus' questions (2. 91. 3–5), while the story of Aristeas' death is first reported as having been heard by Herodotus in Cyzicus and Proconnesus, and then summed up with the words 'this is what these cities say', before he turns to supplementary information coming from Metapontium (4. 14). I prefer to treat all source references as a fundamentally homogeneous system, where the structure and intensity of what Calame calls the *embrayage énonciatif* varies from case to case.[11] Of course, all these statements are to be scrutinized in the framework of Herodotus' authorial interventions in his work. Together they form a metadiscourse that we might call the 'discourse of the ἱστορίη', which underpins, with important variations of intensity, the whole of Herodotus' work. Of this discourse, I shall consider almost exclusively the branch which we might call the 'discourse of the ἀκοή'.[12]

[11] See C. Calame, 'Hérodote sujet de son discours', *Études de lettres* (1986: 3), 25–48, repr. with slight modifications in id., *Le Récit en Grèce ancienne* (Paris, 1986), 69–84 (see now also the English translation by J. Orion, *The Craft of Poetic Speech in Ancient Greece* (Ithaca, NY, 1995), 75–96), a very useful analysis, using semiotic categories, of Herodotus' presence in his work. The *embrayage énonciatif* ('anchoring, or enunciative shift-in' in J. Orion's translation), a term Calame takes from Jakobson, is stronger when Herodotus speaks in the first person and situates the transmission of the information precisely in space and time. Calame's illuminating essay somewhat lacks detail: verbal semantic spheres such as those of οἶδα, ἀκούω, and πυνθάνομαι should also be taken into account.

[12] On different aspects of the problem see the stimulating studies of C. Dewald, 'Narrative Surface and Authorial Voice in Herodotus' Histories', *Arethusa*, 20

Before we proceed with such a scrutiny, however, it is necessary to clear away an implicit assumption which would lead us in the wrong direction. Contrary to what we might think, of the three branches of the discourse of ἱστορίη, i.e. γνώμη, ὄψις, and ἀκοή,[13] the last is felt by Herodotus to be the least powerful. From this point of view, his way of thinking, in spite of a deceptive similarity, is essentially different from that of a modern historian. An example will illustrate this point. Herodotus appears to know, possibly from the experience of previous public readings of his work in whatever form, that the constitutional debate among the Persian grandees which he relates after the murder of the Magi (3. 80–2) is bound to arouse scepticism in his audience as to its authenticity. What would a modern historian do in a similar case? His first instinct would certainly be to quote some official records or other written evidence: this points to another, enormous difference between Herodotus and modern historians.[14] But let us say our modern historian practises oral history. He would then make clear how he knows that the debate really took place, naming his informants and assessing their trustworthiness as well as the objective possibility that they have of being correctly informed. In other words, he would quote his sources and assess their credibility. This is exactly what Herodotus conspicuously does *not* do. In order to validate a point which he knows will be strongly liable to criticism, he uses an analogy[15]—that is, a γνώμη argument, rather than a source reference. Mardonius established democracies in Ionia in 492 (6. 43), so there is no reason to doubt that Otanes really spoke for democracy thirty years before:

(1987), 147–70, and J. Marincola, 'Herodotean Narrative and the Narrator's Presence', ibid. 121–36, in both of which I find the analysis more convincing than the conclusions.

[13] That is, 'argument', 'personal eyewitness', and 'hearsay'. On the tools of Herodotus' ἱστορίη see e.g. A. Corcella, *Erodoto e l'analogia* (Palermo, 1984). With its richness of nuance, ἀκοή is by far the most complex of the three.

[14] The controversial relationship between ancient historians, particularly Herodotus and Thucydides, and written records was a special theme of A. Momigliano; see e.g. 'Storiografia su tradizione scritta e storiografia su tradizione orale', *Atti dell'Accademia delle Scienze di Torino*, 96 (1961–2), 186–97, trans. J. Wardman as 'Historiography on Written Tradition and Historiography on Oral Tradition', in A. Momigliano, *Studies in Historiography* (London, 1966), 211–20; and also *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography* (Berkeley, 1990).

[15] On analogical arguments in Greek thought see G. E. R. Lloyd, *Polarity and Analogy* (Cambridge, 1966), on Herodotus esp. 341–5, and Corcella, *Erodoto e l'analogia* [n. 13].

after all, the Persians were not born enemies of democracy![16] On the other hand, Herodotus often maintains that his business is *λέγειν τὰ λεγόμενα*, to report that which is told, without committing himself as to its credibility; and he twice states the principle, adding explicitly that it is valid for the whole of his work (2. 123. 1; 7. 152. 3). From these observations there may be derived, in my view, a quite important conclusion: for Herodotus, source references are not a very effective instrument for making people believe what he says, his killer arguments rather being *γνώμη* and *ὄψις*.[17] In other words, personal experience and reasoning are stronger arguments than 'what people say'. From a fifth-century Greek, such a position should not be surprising.[18] And incidentally, we ought not to forget that Thucydides, who emphasizes the trustworthiness of what he says much more than Herodotus does, makes almost no use of source references.[19]

If Herodotus is not using source references to lend credibility to his narrative, why does he use them at all? To answer this question, we shall have to look at the references more closely. A first point to be made is that those which are actually given are on the whole no more than samples. In other words, Herodotus clearly shows that he is *not* giving references for all of the pieces of information for which he could; furthermore, with the exception of some particularly strange tales for which he might have felt the need of a source reference as a disclaimer, there is no substantial difference between statements provided with a source reference and those lacking one. But we must remember that Herodotus depicts *the whole of his work* as a product

[16] The defence of democracy by Otanes was almost certainly the point Herodotus expected his audience to find incredible in the debate; on the general (Athenian) perception of the Persians as enemies of democracy see Thuc. 8. 48. 1. The most sensible treatment known to me of the constitutional debate is to be found in D. Lanza, *Il tiranno e il suo pubblico* (Turin, 1977), 225–32.

[17] The idea that in Herodotus source references should serve to validate information is fundamental to Fehling's argument, and is quite authoritatively represented: e.g. Jacoby, 'Herodotos' [n. 9], 401. But see now Shrimpton, *History and Memory* [n. 7] 230–1, for the theory that source references accompany particularly doubtful pieces of information and function as disclaimer rather than as validator.

[18] One hardly needs to recall the opening of Hecataeus' *Genealogies* (*FGrHist* 1 F 1), on which see Bertelli in this volume.

[19] On Thucydides' historical narrative and its way of producing the effect of truth see L. Edmunds, 'Thucydides in the Act of Writing', in *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da Omero all'età ellenistica: Scritti in onore di Bruno Gentili* (Rome, 1993), 831–52. On his use of source references see H. D. Westlake, '*Λέγεται* in Thucydides', *Mnemosyne*[4], 30 (1977), 345–62.

of *ἱστορίη*—that is, *ὄψις*, *γνώμη*, and *ἀκοή*. His frequent references to the process of enquiry are first of all a means of ensuring that his audience do not forget this fundamental point. This seems to me to be particularly evident in the ethnographic sections, where Herodotus time and again says that the locals say this and that particular thing; but he clearly wants his audience to understand that his report as a whole, *ὄψις* or *γνώμη* statements excepted, stems from the locals.[20]

This local dimension is crucial to Herodotus' source references; it is their most essential feature. In a sense, this was perceived by Jacoby, who observed, without pursuing the point in depth, that the people whom Herodotus quotes are always those who must be, for some reason, precisely informed on that matter. But the scholar who made the point most forcefully was Fehling. His 'principle of citing the obvious source' and 'principle of regard for party bias' really allow us to explain all of Herodotus' source references. The two rules had already been pointed out fairly clearly by Panofsky,[21] but his Latin dissertation, not easily accessible of itself, remained buried under the weight of Jacoby's severe and authoritative judgement. Incidentally, Fehling's rules work much better under the presupposition that Herodotus was *not* using source references to deceive his readers. As a deceptive strategy they would be awkward, and they may be explained in a more satisfying way in the framework of Herodotus' audience's expectations, as I shall try to show.

The second rule basically means, in general terms, that one may expect any human group, people or polis, to have a version of its own past which puts that group into a favourable light. I shall come back to this point later, after I have stated the first principle more precisely. Herodotus' source references usually obey the rule that any people is well informed about events which happened or continue to happen in its own country, or which, more rarely, happened to its ancestors elsewhere. Certainly, Herodotus is well aware that some peoples, especially cultivated ones, will try to obtain information on others' deeds, and he presupposes that peoples will communicate with each other. For instance, the Egyptian priests learned through

[20] The clearest example is—not surprisingly—in the Egyptian *λόγος*, where the priests of Memphis, Thebes, and Heliopolis are mentioned as sources for the following exposition (2. 3. 1; 2. 4. 1), and then recalled time and again (2. 10. 1; 2. 13. 1; 2. 19. 1, etc. ; see also 2. 142. 1 and 2. 147. 1).

[21] H. Panofsky, *Quaestionum de Historiae Herodoteae Fontibus Pars Prima* (diss. Berlin, 1885), 27, 39.

investigation—that is, by questioning Menelaus—what the latter did before coming to Egypt, they know precisely what he did while *in* Egypt, but they have no idea where he sailed to after that (2. 119. 3). On the other hand, Herodotus quotes three different Greek—that is, non-indigenous—explanations of the Nile flood, but all of them are based on *γνώμη* and not on local knowledge of any sort (2. 20 ff.). Apart from these apparent exceptions, which really reinforce the rule, Herodotus basically refers to locals for matters regarding their own land. The only true exceptions are a few statements about people living on the margins of the world; concerning the latter, Herodotus may cite the neighbours, following the principle that peoples would speak to each other. This is the case with the Indians, whose dangerous intercourse with gold-mining ants is narrated by the Persians (3. 105). An impressive example of the working of this principle appears in connection with the Hyperboreans: nobody has anything to say about them, except perhaps the Issedonians—that is, the people furthest north of the Black Sea; upon closer scrutiny, Herodotus concludes that not even the Issedonians say anything about the Hyperboreans, for otherwise the Scythians, their neighbours, would also say something—because they themselves would know it from the Issedonians (4. 32).

Through such statements Herodotus is clearly, if implicitly, defining the limits of possible knowledge in time and space.[22] His sensitivity on this matter is demonstrated by phrases such as 'so far as I have been able to push my enquiries', which Herodotus uses both in a chronological sense, concerning events that happened in very ancient times, about which he would not usually speak (1. 171. 1, the relations between King Minos and the Carians)[23]—and in a geographical sense, for places which he depicts as very difficult to reach (2. 29. 1, the springs of the Nile; 4. 16. 2, in general terms, about his reaching as far as he can in the Black Sea area; 4. 192. 3, animal species among the nomad Libyans). Generally speaking, the limitations that exist on knowledge of events from the past are a central concern for Herodotus, who says at the very beginning of his work that he is writing to prevent great deeds from fading away from human memory. An important condition that prevents

[22] Fehling, *Herodotus and his 'Sources'* [n. 4], 121, realized this, but failed to draw the right conclusions from his observation.

[23] For the extension of Herodotus' *ἱστορίη* in the past see P. Vannicelli, *Erodoto e la storia dell'alto e medio arcaismo* (Rome, 1993).

such deeds from being forgotten is the existence of a community capable of transmitting their memory: Egyptian history is told only by Egyptians down to the reign of Psammetichus, who was the first to use Greek mercenary soldiers; what Herodotus says about the period after him (2. 147. 1 and 2. 154. 4) is told to him by Egyptians and others—i.e. Greeks.[24] We shall see later that not all communities are thought able to perform this transmission of memory to the same degree. In its geographical version, this principle of the spreading of knowledge among conterminous peoples means that it is impossible to know anything precise about the Nile springs, or, in Herodotus' words, that no one says anything about them, because they lie in uninhabited land (2. 34. 1).

Now, if we were to take all these so-called source references as referring to the way in which Herodotus collected every single piece of information, and especially to the places where he collected it, I think we could not avoid Fehling's conclusion: they are absolutely too good to be true. The way information is attributed to groups and/or divided among them is clearly artificial: think again of the Egyptian priests, knowing about the Trojan war because Menelaus, coming to Egypt, had been asked about it by their ancestors (Herodotus actually says that Menelaus had been interviewed by the priests themselves, a formulation which demonstrates his assumptions about the continuity of a human group's memory over time). Or think of the story of Alyattes' questioning of the oracle at Delphi, conveniently divided between Delphians and Milesians (1. 20). The point is that we have to de-emphasize the concrete meaning of these source references—or ἀκοή statements, as they may be more correctly called.[25] First of all, although they do directly refer to the act of speaking, this should not be taken literally, as the very fact that they are usually made collectively should have

[24] Hdt. 2. 154. 4 is a particularly impressive statement of Herodotus' assumptions regarding the continuity of memory inside a group: the Greeks know ἀτρεκέως what has happened in Egypt since Psammetichus, because from that time there has been a Greek community there.

[25] Here I cannot but refer to H. Erbse, *Studien zum Verständnis Herodots* (Berlin and New York, 1992), 76 n. 6: 'Der irreführende (da mehrdeutige) Ausdruck "Quellenangabe" . . . . sollte in der Herodotforschung vermieden werden' ('the expression "source reference", misleading because ambiguous, should be avoided in Herodotean studies'). And on a more general level see S. Hornblower, 'Intertextuality and the Greek Historians', in *Greek Historiography* (Oxford, 1994), 54–72 at 71: 'the historians of antiquity should be treated as products of their age, not as if they themselves were carrying out *Quellenforschung*, the scientific study of sources'.

made clear to modern interpreters from the very beginning. As Erbse pointed out, in Greek prose λέγω may mean 'to believe, to think'; that is, Herodotus' ἀκοή statements are to be understood as references to the group that believes it knows—in the sense of holding as true—a certain tale or piece of information. This point is best illustrated by a passage from Thucydides, which is all the more decisive, since Thucydides' very few source references have never been suspected as strongly as Herodotus' have. The Athenian demos knows (ἐπιστάμενος) something by ἀκοή (6. 53. 3) about the expulsion of the Pisistratids, but Thucydides argues that the Athenians do not say (λέγοντας) anything precise on the point (6. 54. 1). There can scarcely be any doubt that the two verbs are used with the same meaning. Another example, a Herodotean one, comes from the story of the Medism of Argos. At the end of the debate Herodotus adds that some Greeks held (λέγουσι) that two Athenian ambassadors at Artaxerxes' court in Susa had met an Argive embassy which aimed to renew the friendship with the Persians established at the time of Xerxes' expedition (7. 151). At first glance we might think that Herodotus does not state explicitly whether or not it was the Athenian ambassadors who told this story because he does not want to put Argos' case too badly, but that is just half the truth at most. Any reader/listener would understand by implication that the story came from the ambassadors, otherwise Herodotus would not have mentioned them at all. The relevant point for him is not whether it was the two Athenians who had told it, but rather that some Greeks 'said' it in the sense that they were ready to believe that it had actually taken place—that is to say, they held it to be true. In a world of oral communication, the meaning of such an expression must have been obvious.[26]

If Herodotus really faked these ἀκοή statements in order to fool his audience, as Fehling would have it, then he did a very poor job. The way in which such statements are attributed to different

[26] By this I am not proposing a distinction between cases where λέγω means 'to believe, to hold for true' and cases where it simply means 'to say/speak', a distinction which might then be connected with that between statements of direct contact with informants and general collective hearsay statements. On the reason why I prefer not to insist on this distinction, see above; here I merely note the fact that Herodotus also has collective statements combined with direct contact, e.g. 2. 32. 1. I should rather argue that the semantic field of the Greek verb λέγειν is different from that of verbs such as 'to say/speak', and that the difference depends roughly upon a minor emphasis of the distinction between having an opinion and expressing it: λέγω means both.

groups, which Fehling calls the 'quotation of the obvious source', must already have been obvious to Herodotus' ancient audience; they will probably have noticed it much more easily than we do, obsessed as we are with the problem of Herodotus' sources and credibility. However, these references to the provenance of his information would not have disturbed them, I suppose, because they would have understood what Herodotus meant, and recognized in his usage their own perceptions and experience. In other words, with his *ἀκοή* statements Herodotus is not quoting sources, as a modern historian does, but is simply referring to what he holds to be the social and/or ethnic dimension of the knowledge he is drawing from.[27] Fehling's principle of the 'regard for party bias' allows this to be shown very clearly. I shall once again illustrate the point with an example from Thucydides, who is otherwise extremely sparing with *ἀκοή* statements. In a passage describing an event that takes place just before the actual outbreak of the Peloponnesian war—where, incidentally, he appears silently to correct Herodotus[28]—Thucydides gives the Theban and the Plataean versions of the murder of certain Theban prisoners of war at Plataea (2. 6). Of course, since Thucydides is Thucydides, it has never occurred to anyone that this *ἀκοή* statement might be a fake, and indeed there is no reason to think that it is. On the other hand, it testifies to the same reality which is reflected in many Herodotean *ἀκοή* statements about wars and feuds among Greek cities. These feuds were an everyday occurrence for most Greeks, and they would certainly expect the Spartans and Samians to have different versions of the story of how a Spartan krater destined for Croesus had landed in the Samian Heraion (1. 70. 2–3); nor would they be surprised that Crotoniates and Sybarites disagreed about the circumstances of the former's destruction of the latter's city (5. 44). Incidentally,

[27] See now Shrimpton, *History and Memory* [n. 7], 109: 'People are simply made to say, think, or report what he [sc. Herodotus] supposes any reasonable person would expect them to do.' The question, relevant in this connection, whether Herodotus' immediate predecessors and colleagues also followed his practice cannot be answered for lack of evidence; Thucydides' *ἀκοή* statements (on which see Westlake, '*Λέγεται* in Thucydides' [n. 19], and Nicolai in this volume) seem to me to be consistent with the assumptions behind Herodotus'—save for the fact that Thucydides' assessment of this sort of knowledge radically diverges from Herodotus'. For hints of *ἀκοή* statements in Hecataeus see *FGrHist* 1 F 21 and F 328b.

[28] Cf. Hdt. 7. 233. 2, and see S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides*, ii (Oxford, 1996), 136 (reprint of 'Thucydides' Use of Herodotus', in J. M. Sanders (ed.), *Φιλολάκων: Lakonian Studies in Honor of Hector Catling* (Athens, 1992), 141–54).

such contrasting *ἀκοή* statements form about two-thirds of all the Greeks' *ἀκοή* statements in Herodotus, and this is certainly not without meaning.

Apart from 'biased memory', the local distribution of knowledge must also in many other ways have been an everyday experience for Herodotus' audience. Any of them would have known, or been able to learn easily, about the religious festivals they took part in; they would have known that in the main shrines of their towns, and still more in the panhellenic sanctuaries, they could find extravagant votive objects whose origins were explained by stories that were attached to them. This sort of tradition, which Vansina calls iconatrophy,[29] would often include spurious information; it is by no means exclusive to oral cultures, but tends to be seen as second-class knowledge and to be located in peripheral groups or lower social levels of societies which commend knowledge about the past to written records and officially recognize only the authority of these—professionalizing and institutionalizing memory, as it were.[30] In Herodotus' Greece, knowledge about the recent past, as distinct from that of the time of the heroes sung by the poets, was only just beginning to be the business of a group of specialists; the average cultivated Athenian would have thought he knew the past of his polis—both the distant mythical one narrated by the poets and the recent one, still in the range of living memory, and also in part raised to the level of myth by the poets, as was the case with the Persian wars.[31] The perception of culture and memory as belonging to the ethnic or political community as a whole, despite the fact that only more or less restricted groups really had a share in it, has been pointed out by Assmann as typical of ancient cultures, but 'national' memories of modern nation-states seem to show the same (restricted) social distribution.[32] This idea of the past as a

[29] J. Vansina, *Oral Tradition as History* (London, 1985), 44–5.

[30] On knowledge about the past and its distribution inside society, see J. Fentress and C. Wickham, *The Social Memory* (Oxford, 1992), 45–87.

[31] The distinction between these two kinds of past, as concerns their function, meaning, and social localization, is worked out thoroughly by J. Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen* (Munich, 1992), esp. 48–56. It is important to underline that the difference is not simply one of distance in time; Aeschylus' and Simonides' poetical works on the Persian wars show that selected parts of the recent past could also be given a standing analogous to that of myths of the heroic age.

[32] See Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis* [n. 31], 149–50, and Fentress and Wickham, *The Social Memory* [n. 30], 127.

shared possession is fundamental for Herodotus' ἀκοή statements. It explains their collective form and shows why he could use this form without fear of being misunderstood by his audience.

By this I am not at all advocating the view that what Herodotus records about the history of Greece from the late archaic age to the Persian wars really amounts to a collection of official traditions or collective memories of each single polis. Rosalind Thomas has rightly stressed that a Greek polis would not own a large and detailed corpus of official traditions, carefully transmitted and subject to public control. Her analysis of the traditions about the fall of the Pisistratids and the birth of democracy in Athens shows that Herodotus' version of these events actually consists of a partial fusion of accounts of various origins, not necessarily coherent with each other, none of which may be called official in any useful way.[33] Traces of what might be called a polis tradition emerge in the background, but such a tradition would preserve just an outline of past events and, more importantly, the guidelines of their interpretation. The richness in detail which is characteristic of Herodotus' accounts is not to be expected from this kind of tradition, and is much more likely to come from individual recollections, family tradition, or folk-tale-like narratives.

These observations also shed light on the other Herodotean narratives of Greek history. The kind of party or family bias which is obvious in the Athenian tradition[34] can be detected in other cases as well, every time Herodotus' accounts grow more detailed. Leaving aside the case of Cyrene,[35] we see family traditions emerging in the story of the Spartans Lichas (1. 67. 5–68) and Archias (3. 55. 2), and different party biases are obvious in Herodotus' report of Samian history from the Spartan expedition against Polycrates to the rise of Syloson and beyond. This fact notwithstanding, Herodotus never gives the precise origin of the single pieces of information which he gathered. In his ἀκοή statements he always credits a community with knowledge about its own past. The two cases in which he quotes a single Greek informant confirm this rule *e contrario*;

[33] R. Thomas, *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens* (Cambridge, 1989), esp. 196–237 (on polis tradition) and 238–82 (on the traditions about the expulsion of the Pisistratids).

[34] On the tradition of Athenian aristocratic families in Herodotus see O. Murray, 'Herodotus and Oral History', in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg and A. Kuhrt (eds.), *Achaemenid History*, ii. *The Greek Sources* (Leiden, 1987), reprinted in this volume.

[35] On which see Giangiulio in this volume.

in both of them the information conveyed is relevant only for the informer and his family, not for the polis as a whole.[36] It is a typical irony of history, I would say, that has Herodotus bring to light the potential contradictions of local knowledge as well as the instruments to recognize them, without, however, exploiting his own discovery to its full potential. Certainly he sometimes, but very rarely, notices contradictions in local traditions, but he does not make of them a general problem (with the partial and enigmatic exception of traditions about Persia, to be discussed later). It will be left to Thucydides to objectify the perception that, for instance, the Athenians did indeed have no accurate knowledge of their own past. Thucydides' criticism in the Archaeology (1. 20. 1) and the Pisistratid excursus is aimed exactly at the conception of local knowledge which Herodotus takes as a model for his *ἀκοή* statements.

Provided that these points are sound, they hold true for the whole of the *Histories*, or, as Herodotus would say, for the whole of his *λόγος*. But the discourse of *ἀκοή*, although spanning the work from beginning to end, does not remain unchanged throughout. On the contrary, it undergoes a series of modifications which, as I shall try to show, are all interconnected, so that a closer scrutiny allows one to delineate the characteristics of the discourse of *ἀκοή* for each *λόγος*—or at least, for the most complex of them. I choose as examples the sections on the Egyptians, the Scythians, and the Persians. Finally, I shall try to outline the implications of these different types of discourses of *ἀκοή* for the kind of discourse which Herodotus applies to Greek *ἀκοαί*.

Let us start with Egypt. If almost every discussion of Herodotus' credibility concentrates on this part of his work, the reason is not simply that he here tells particularly bizarre tales, but also that the discourse of *ἱστορίη* is nowhere else so detailed and explicit as here. In a very valuable study, John Marincola[37] was able to show that fifteen out of a total of twenty-one autopsy statements in Herodotus come from the Egyptian *λόγος* alone, and this is not all: Herodotus'

[36] As acutely noticed by J. Gould, *Herodotus* (London, 1989), 22. The two cases are Archias the Spartan (3. 55. 2) and Thersander the Orchomenian (9. 16). Another apparent exception is the three priestesses of Zeus at Dodona, Promeneia, Timarete, and Nicandre (2. 52–5). However, what they say is on the one hand confirmed by the other Dodoneans; and on the other, they tell the ancient history of another group, one they do not belong to, the Pelasgians. On the reasons for this see below.

[37] See above, n. 12.

γνώμη is nowhere more prominent than it is in his description of Egypt, and ἀκοή statements are also much more detailed and frequent than elsewhere. Only here does Herodotus tell us exactly where his information comes from, specifying the origin of almost the entire λόγος. Furthermore, ἱστορίη statements in the imperfect tense, and therefore referring to a specific occasion, are more than twice as frequent in this section than in all the rest of the *Histories* taken together. Here the ἱστορίη is itself described as a historical event, with a precise chronological dimension, and Herodotus occasionally even tells us how he received a particular confirmatory piece of information after he had already formed his opinion (2. 18. 1; 2. 104. 1). Altogether, the characteristics of the discourse of ἱστορίη in the Egyptian λόγος cannot be explained satisfactorily in biographical terms, if only because such an explanation would yield paradoxical results if broadened to the whole of the *Histories*—and also because, within the Egyptian λόγος, statements about the origin of information are more frequent and detailed than usual, even in cases where Herodotus is not referring to matters Egyptian. Therefore, I prefer to confine myself to the objective observation that the discourse of ἱστορίη, and the discourse of ἀκοή as a subentity of it, here reach a peak of intensity.[38] Rather than questioning the credibility of Herodotus' report, we should perhaps start to ask what has caused this peak. As a provisional answer, I should suggest that the meaning this high intensity is supposed to convey is that, in Herodotus' view, Egypt offered conditions for the practice of ἱστορίη which were better than anywhere else.

In Egypt, Herodotus also shows explicit concern for the quality of his informers. He searches for the best possible, telling us that the Heliopolitans are held to be the most competent among the Egyptians, the λογιώτατοι (2. 3. 1); and then, before turning to Egypt's ancient history, he states that 'the inhabitants of corn-breeding Egypt', i.e. of the Nile valley south of the Delta, are the men who more than any other exercise their memory, and therefore are the λογιώτατοι among those of whom he made trial (2. 77. 1). Admittedly, these all-knowing Egyptians may sometimes pretend to know a little too much—as in the case of the scribe of Athena's

[38] Or, with Calame's categories, that the *embrayage énonciatif* is at its strongest. In other words, I prefer to consider the difference between the Egyptian λόγος and the rest of the *Histories* as one of measure rather than one of quality. Against the tempation to treat the Egyptian λόγος as a special case see e.g. Jacoby, 'Herodotos' [n. 9], 397.

treasury at Sais, who gives an account of the Nile springs which Herodotus labels as fictitious (2. 28. 1). But this is an isolated case, as Herodotus emphasizes by means of the latter individual reference.[39]

The easiness with which Herodotus speaks of 'the inhabitants of corn-breeding Egypt', while he has himself specified that his informers were priests, is merely a confirmation that the perception lying at the base of his collective ἀκοή statements follows Assmann's principle: the knowledge of a cultivated élite inside the community is presented as what that community as a whole 'says', i.e. knows. Another interesting point concerns the way in which this admirable Egyptian memory was transmitted. If we read only the passage which I have just mentioned (2. 77. 1), we would think that Herodotus' Egyptians were some sort of masters of memory, able to learn by heart huge amounts of information and transmit it by word of mouth. But we would be wrong. In fact, the list of the 330 kings of Egypt from Min to Moeris is read by the priests from a scroll (2. 100. 1); furthermore, the distance between the birth of the last of the gods, Dionysus, and King Amasis is calculated as fifteen thousand years, and the Egyptians say that they know this exactly because they had always kept track of the years and written them down (2. 145. 3). This brings us to a point of general relevance. Herodotus knows that the prodigious memory of the Egyptians is based on written records, but he does not put any great emphasis on this fact. Coming from a world where the past was *not* preserved mainly through written records, Herodotus does not fully recognize the potential of writing as an instrument to that end. Of course, he would be aware of the potential of literature for preserving great deeds for future generations, but an archive of written documents is quite another matter.[40] For him, the written

[39] S. Lewis, *News and Society in the Greek Polis* (London, 1996), 86, observes that the untrustworthy informer is after all 'only a scribe'; cf. J. A. S. Evans, *Herodotus, Explorer of the Past: Three Essays* (Princeton, 1991), 136–7 (but the relevant point is not so much the true status of this man in the sanctuary, as the Greeks' view of the status of a scribe).

[40] For Herodotus, the written word has not yet gained autonomy from and authority over the spoken. His attitude seems typical of a transitional phase, in which writing is still perceived as an aide-mémoire. See R. Thomas, *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge, 1992), esp. 74–100; ead., *Oral Tradition and Written Record* [n. 33], 15–94; cf. Fentress and Wickham, *The Social Memory* [n. 30], 10–11, and the illuminating study by M. T. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066–1307*, 2nd edn. (Oxford, 1993).

word may substantially aid memory, not replace it. It will fall to Plato, in the imaginary dialogue between Solon and a priest at Sais (an ironical allusion to Herodotus' scribe?), to emphasize that the prodigious depth of Egyptian memory depended on the preservation of written records from the very beginning of man's history, made possible by the fact that Egypt was protected against the natural catastrophes which had destroyed the Proto-Greeks' archives (*Tim.* 23 A).[41] Significantly, Plato's priest tells Solon the most ancient history *of Athens*, recorded through *ἀκοαί* written down by the Egyptians in the most distant past. Plato is aware that written memory can survive independently of the human group which produced it, provided that the records do not come to be destroyed.

It is time now to leave the venerable culture of Egypt, and turn to a much less civilized corner of the ancient world. Next to the Egyptian *λόγος*, the Scythian *λόγος* is the one where the discourse of *ἱστορίη* is more conspicuous.[42] Statements recording autopsy or direct *ἀκοή*, though far rarer than in Egypt, are still much more frequent than in the remaining parts of Herodotus' work. But the nature of the discourse of *ἱστορίη* is completely different from, or even opposite to, that concerning Egypt. The emphasis is definitely on the difficulty or impossibility of gathering information (e.g. 4. 16. 1; 4. 25. 2), and this emphasis is neatly paralleled by the comparative lack of chronological depth in this *λόγος*. There is nothing resembling an ancient history of the Scythians, who on the other hand consider themselves to be the youngest people of all (4. 5. 1). The Black Sea area, says Herodotus, is the one which harbours the most ignorant peoples he knows, and he is not aware that any *λόγιος* man has ever been born there except for Anacharsis (4. 46. 1); but the Scythians even go so far as to deny knowing who Anacharsis was. Were it not for Tymnes, perhaps a Carian or more probably

[41] In this case, the gap between Herodotus and Plato as regards the status and use of writing should not be overemphasized: Plato's ancient Egyptians had written down *ἀκοαί*, not collected Greek books and copied them. Incidentally, the story of Solon in Egypt is replete with Herodotean reminiscences and allusions, announced by the words of Dropides (*Tim.* 19 E), quoting almost literally Herodotus' proem; Solon reconstructs the chronology of the mythic era and connects it to the present through genealogical reckoning (*Tim.* 22 A–B), just as Hecataeus had 'genealogized himself' at Thebes, reaching a god in the sixteenth generation (Hdt. 2. 143. 1); and both of them get mocked by the Egyptian priests, who show them the real depth of the past.

[42] On the Scythian *λόγος*, F. Hartog, *Le Miroir d'Hérodote: Essai sur la représentation de l'autre*, 2nd edn. (Paris, 1991), is a classic, although one may not agree with all of its presuppositions (more in Luraghi, 'Erodoto tra storia e fantasia' [n. 6]).

an Eastern Greek with a Carian name,[43] Herodotus would not have found any information about Anacharsis in the region (4. 76. 5–6). It is true that the Spartans claimed to know something about Anacharsis, but their story is exposed by Herodotus as a Greek invention (4. 77).

In many senses, the Scythian λόγος may be read as a mirror image of the Egyptian one; but to pursue this in detail, however interesting it may be, would carry us too far from our subject.[44] Suffice it to say that with the Egyptians ἱστορίη works very well, and with the Scythians hardly at all. What of the Persians? In their case, the problem seems to be that they do not agree with each other. No other human group is credited with such a high number of variant versions of its own past: the multiplicity of Persian traditions is repeatedly emphasized by Herodotus. For the two versions of Oebares' stratagem to bring Darius to the throne (3. 87), he feels the need to specify that both of them are told by the Persians. For Cyrus' birth, he finds as many as three different versions, and chooses to follow the one told by certain Persians who do not want to aggrandize Cyrus, but to keep to the truth (1. 95. 1). Cyrus' death is also narrated in many different ways, although here Herodotus does not explicitly say by whom (1. 214. 5). We should not fail to notice that the two explicit statements of plurality in the Persian tradition are associated with crucial moments in Persian history: the foundation of the Achaemenid empire by Cyrus and its refoundation by Darius, after the dynastic crisis that had followed Cyrus' death. In other words, the Persians know their past, but have a tendency to embellish it; and, more importantly, the things they say about it are contradictory.

Now, Herodotus occasionally records alternative versions elsewhere without mentioning their origin, perhaps implying that they are to be taken as different local versions; but the Persians are the only ones to whom he explicitly attributes two or three different versions of a story from their own past. The reason why Herodotus

[43] Carian names are not infrequent among Ionian aristocrats of the late archaic period; cf. e.g. G. Neumann, 'Zum Namen des Cheramyes von Samos', *WJA* 10 (1984), 41–3. On the transmission of foreign names through ξενία, see G. Herman, 'Patterns of Name Diffusion within the Greek World and Beyond', *CQ*, NS 40 (1990), 349–63.

[44] I shall mention just one point: here, as in Egypt, Herodotus mentions a predecessor (4. 13, 16); it is only our schematic distinction of the genres that prevented us from noticing that the presence of Aristeas in the Scythian λόγος parallels that of Hecataeus in the Egyptian; Herodotus, of course, dissociates himself from both.

represents Persian memory in this way is open to speculation. My suggestion is that he intends to convey the impression that Persian memory was ambiguous. This ambiguity of Persian recollections probably explains why Herodotus feels the need to point out, at the very beginning of his work, that the version he is giving, and rejecting, of the origin of the feud between Greeks and barbarians is that of those Persians who are *λόγιοι* (1. 1. 1).[45] The uncertainty is the characteristic feature of the discourse of *ἱστορίη* Herodotus applies to Persia.[46] In Egypt one finds people who are very cultivated and well informed, in the Black Sea area only ignorant peoples, while in Persia one had best make sure just whom one is speaking with!

Compared with these three cases, the discourse of *ἱστορίη* is clearly less prominent when Herodotus speaks of Greeks. The reason, I suppose, is that he feels no need to explain to the Greeks how it would be possible to gather information in their own environment. We must not forget that Herodotus, although writing for the future, has a very Greek audience in mind; he says, for instance, that he is not going to describe the camel because the Greeks know what it looks like (3. 103). A special case is made of the Spartans, famous as they were for not being generous with information about themselves. In relation to this people, Thucydides speaks of *τῆς πολιτείας τὸ κρυπτόν* (5. 68. 2), state-implemented secrecy, as a well-known fact, and Herodotus clearly feels his audience might be interested in having some information about them—information which he promptly gives with a distinctly ethnographic tone, comparing the Spartans with the Persians and the Egyptians (6. 56–60). Furthermore, Spartan secrecy is implicitly made apparent by Herodotus when he twice states (1. 66. 4; 6. 52. 1) that the Spartans and the other Greeks had quite different ideas about Sparta's distant past—a statement he does not make in connection with any other Greek polis. However, in relating things Greek, Herodotus generally does not take care to assess the quality of his information explicitly, i.e. to say which Greeks are *λόγιοι* and which are not.[47] This does not

[45] In other words, the question implicitly answered by mentioning *τῶν Περσέων οἱ λόγιοι* is not 'which *λόγιοι* say this?' but 'which Persians say this?', as is also shown by 1. 95. 1. On the meaning of *λόγιος* see below. On Hdt. 1. 1–5 see H. Pelliccia, 'Sappho 16, Gorgias' *Helen*, and the Preface to Herodotus' *Histories*', *YCS* 29 (1992), 63–84.

[46] See also 1. 140. 1, at the end of the ethnological excursus about the Persians, the distinction between what Herodotus has been told clearly and unclearly; among the latter, he mentions the treatment of corpses by the Persians.

[47] What he does show, from time to time, is a certain preoccupation with the social

mean, I think, that the λόγιοι ἄνδρες are to be taken as an institution typical of barbarian peoples, with no Greek equivalents, as von Fritz thought.[48] We only have to recall Pindar (*Pyth.* 1. 94; *Nem.* 6. 45) to see that λόγιοι Greeks are feasible.[49] But this is another point which needs to be strongly de-emphasized. If one reads in Herodotus only what he actually says, it is completely clear that when he tells us which people are λόγιοι he does not have in mind professional remembrancers,[50] or some sort of masters of memory, who store the community's knowledge about the past and hand it over by word of mouth; the λόγιοι ἄνδρες as an institution exist only in modern scholarship. In Herodotus, λόγιος is an attribute, not a predicate; the question is not who are the λόγιοι ἄνδρες of each group, but rather who is λόγιος and who is not, and who is more λόγιος than the others.[51] In representing to a Greek audience

status of his Greek informants, not untypical of a Greek historian: cf. Lewis, *News and Society* [n. 39], 85–9.

[48] K. von Fritz, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung*, i. *Anmerkungen* (Berlin, 1967), 343–7. The fact that Herodotus' λόγιοι are exclusively non-Greek does not seem accidental to me either, but I would rather explain it in a different way.

[49] Not that it is clear what exactly Pindar's λόγιοι should be. For a detailed discussion see M. R. Calabrese De Feo, 'Interpretazione e restauro testuale in Pindaro *Py.* I 92–94 e *Ne.* VI 29–30', in G. Arrighetti (ed.), *Interpretazioni antiche e moderne di testi greci* (Ricerche di filologia classica, 3; Pisa, 1987), 25–38; G. Nagy, 'Herodotus the *Logios*', *Arethusa*, 20 (1987), 175–84; and id., *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past* (Baltimore and London, 1990), 215–25. It is good to keep in mind, incidentally, that Pindar is the only classical author to speak of λόγιοι Greeks. Other authors rather follow Herodotus' use, restricting the term to alien cultures. For more on this point see my forthcoming article 'The Importance of Being *Logios*'.

[50] As they are known to exist, or to have existed, mostly in societies characterized by illiteracy or restricted literacy; see e.g. M. T. Clanchy, 'Remembering the Past and the Good Old Law', *History*, 55 (1970), 165–76 at 168–70. From a Greek viewpoint, so to speak, it is interesting to observe that such professional remembrancers seem to be typical of groups in which the past is—or tends to be—monopolized by a centralized government; cf. the telling case of Hieda no Are (a woman, by the way), who was ordered by Temmu Tenno (7th cent. AD) to learn by heart the royal genealogies and ancient legends in order to efface the 'deviating' traditions of the great families; see J. Konishi, *A History of Japanese Literature*, i. (Princeton, 1984), 254–6.

[51] For this reason I tend to disagree with Nagy, 'Herodotus the *Logios* [n. 49], both in making of Herodotus a λόγιος and in interpreting λόγιος as a performer of oral prose traditions (see the criticism of Nagy's theories by W. R. Connor in *Arethusa*, 20 (1987), 259–60, and Nagy's reply, ibid. 209–10). Evans, *Herodotus, Explorer of the Past* [n. 39], 113–31, goes further in the same direction, conjuring up prose memorialists in archaic Greece, called λόγιοι, whose features are completely derived from African cultures; needless to say, no single Greek source corroborates the hypothesis. By the way, describing himself making trial of people in order to assess how λόγιοι they are (see Vannicelli in this volume on 2. 77. 1 and the διάπειρα),

barbarian knowledge—or alien wisdom, as we might rather say—it is important to him to characterize such knowledge, to vouch for the quality of the information. To do this he uses an extremely non-committal word, which means 'learned, cultivated, clever'.[52] He avoids doing anything like this in Greece simply because he thinks that in this case his audience does not need any such information.

In a sense, therefore, Jacoby was probably right to assume that Herodotus' informers will always have been *λόγιοι*.[53] There is no reason to doubt that, in carrying out his enquiry, Herodotus actually took care to speak with learned people, in Greece as well as abroad; as Thucydides says, he did not gather his information from the first person he chanced to meet (1. 22. 2). On the other hand, I think that Jacoby was definitely wrong in maintaining that any *ἀκοή* statement like 'the Spartans say' is to be taken as an abridged form of 'the Spartan *λόγιοι* say'. The point is not whether Herodotus really learnt about the Greek past from high-standing and cultivated people—of course he did. But assessing whether the Greeks are *λόγιοι* or not, or which Greeks are more *λόγιοι* than the others, simply does not belong to the discourse of *ἱστορίη*, and is of no interest for Herodotus' implied audience. Greek knowledge about the past is represented by him, and I stress represented, as collective, without concentrations or specializations. Jacoby's claim is a consequence of taking the discourse of *ἱστορίη* as an objective representation of the way in which Herodotus worked. Provided that the *ἀκοή* statements cannot be taken literally, in the sense that Herodotus cannot possibly have questioned the different citizen bodies united in assembly, Jacoby takes these statements as metonymies while I prefer to take them as metaphors. In my opinion, they do not have much to do with the way in which Herodotus really collected his information, both in Greece and overseas. He is simply presenting to his audience the local knowledge in a recognizable way, and his *ἀκοή* statements are not intended to spell out the source of such knowledge, but rather to make explicit what today's oral histori-

Herodotus implicitly claims for himself a superior position. On these problems see my forthcoming article 'The Importance of Being *Logios*'.

[52] There is a law in classical scholarship which states that, on every topic one can think of, a German dissertation already exists. In this case, see E. Orth, *Logios* (diss. Leipzig, 1926), the most extensive collection of evidence on the meaning of this word.

[53] For a statement of Jacoby's position see e.g. *Atthis* (Oxford, 1949), 215–16 and 389 n. 5.

ans would call its 'social surface'[54]—that is, the group to which it belongs, the group which holds it to be true.

Incidentally, this way of representing knowledge also explains, in my opinion, why Herodotus does not quote as sources the works of his predecessors, which he may well have used. For him, as well as for his audience, the written word as such would not necessarily carry a special authority, particularly if written just a few decades before him—as was the case with the work of other historians. Furthermore, we must not forget that in Herodotus' discourse of ἱστορίη there seems to be no sharp distinction between direct and indirect ἀκοαί from the viewpoint of credibility. To him it suffices to show that somewhere, at the end of the chain, there is someone who knows what he is talking about, an eyewitness, a local—as in the case of the report of the Nasamones about the Nile springs, related by the king of the Ammonians to some Cyreneans, and heard by Herodotus from them (2. 32. 1–33. 2). Once again, his discourse mirrors the experience of his audience, who would be far less familiar with written accounts than with narratives transmitted by word of mouth.

The quotation of Hecataeus' statement about the *Schuldfrage* in the conflict between the Athenians and the Pelasgians (6. 137) is only partially an exception. In fact, although the Pelasgians appear quite often in Herodotus, if we collect all the ἀκοή statements concerning them we immediately notice a rather strange phenomenon: it is always someone else who speaks about them, be it the priestesses of Zeus at Dodona (2. 52. 2–53. 3), the Athenians, or Hecataeus (6. 137).[55] Apart from populations living on the fringes of the world, the Pelasgians are the only ones who never 'speak' themselves, the only ones about whom only other people 'speak'. In the light of Herodotus' general treatment of the continuity of memory within a group over time, it seems that in the case of the Pelasgians he wished to emphasize a breach of memory—or, in other words, that for some reason he was not willing to admit

[54] The notion of social surface was put forward by H. Moniot, 'Les sources de l'histoire africaine', in H. Deschamps (ed.), *Histoire générale de l'Afrique noire*, i (Paris, 1970), 123–47 at 134–5.

[55] This interruption of group memory might also be the reason why Herodotus refers to named persons—Hecataeus or the three priestesses Promeneia, Timarete, and Nicandre (2. 55. 3)—as saying something about the Pelasgians (the collective reference to the Athenians at 6. 137 does not contradict this observation, for they are simply giving their viewpoint). On the problematic Pelasgians in Herodotus see further Thomas in this volume.

that the Pelasgians of his own day were true descendants of the ancient Pelasgians (see 1. 57). Therefore, Herodotus' quotation of Hecataeus does not amount to an admission of the authority of a written text, but rather underscores a paradoxical case, one in which certain past events cannot be depicted as belonging to any living group.

To sum up, I am convinced that Herodotus' ἀκοή statements are not to be understood as a guide to the provenance of the information gathered in the *Histories*; they are no source references. Together with the whole of the discourse of ἱστορίη, they describe Herodotus' enquiry and the nature of the knowledge collected by him in a way which his audience was expected to find realistic. The discourse of ἱστορίη, however, is a metadiscourse on the *Histories* themselves and on their implied author, not an autobiography of Herodotus. To be sure, I do not think for a moment that Herodotus intended to conceal the origin of the information he collected, and least of all that he was attempting to cheat his audience. He merely represented knowledge in the way in which it would usually be conceived and experienced by his audience. As the contents of his work show, his methods of enquiry created the starting-point to expose the limits of this kind of knowledge—showing that the past is not what everybody knows, but rather something which one has to reconstruct by carefully comparing different versions and assessing their truthfulness. However, Herodotus does not seem to have fully realized how his ἱστορίη, far from being just a critical collection of local knowledge, would call into question the very nature and validity of that knowledge.[56]

[56] See Thomas, *Oral Tradition and Written Record* [n. 33], 248–51: Herodotus' collection of traditions makes apparent the contradictions which oral tradition, by its very nature, was able to accommodate without noticing the discrepancy.

8

Kissing Cousins: Some Curious Cases of Adjacent Material in Herodotus

ALAN GRIFFITHS

THIS paper examines three pairs of passages in Herodotus which sit right next to each other in the text and seem to be about quite different things. I hope to show that these contiguous sections are in fact intimately linked—whether by what used to be called 'archaic logic', or some other mechanism of association—in a kind of symbiotic relationship. The juxtaposed elements turn out in each case to be complementary, or paraphrastic, or to provide reciprocal illumination in some way; they seem to mirror each other.

We shall be dealing, then, with latent meaning: meaning which, whatever its nature or purpose, is not up front and does not declare itself on the surface; it must be excavated, deduced. The text contains more than it is prepared to admit. I am not talking here, of course, about techniques of deconstruction, by which texts of any and every kind can be made to yield up implicit meanings, but about properties which are intrinsic to early Greek discourse and to Herodotus' compositional practice in particular. If the case I shall try to make is felt to have any validity, it should certainly have important implications for the theme of this book, the birth of Greek historiography.

We should ask ourselves at this point, before proceeding further, whether such an interpretative framework is legitimate. Is there at least prima facie evidence that Herodotus' text responds fruitfully to an analysis of this kind?

Here is an example which may establish that it does. In book 1,

chapter 78, we are told of the bizarre zoological phenomenon which supposedly occurred before the Persians arrived to besiege Croesus' capital at Sardis. Suddenly a plague of snakes appeared in the *proasteion*—the approaches to the city gates;[1] and the Lydian horses abandoned their pastures, stopped eating grass, and started devouring the snakes instead. Clearly, an omen, one which was sent from heaven as a coded notification of the outcome of the battle which was soon to be fought outside the city, πρὸ τοῦ ἄστεος. Equally clearly, the horses and the snakes represent the Lydians and the Persians. But which is which? Who is going to win? Croesus sends a delegation to the oracle at Telmessus to find out the answer. Unfortunately, the reply arrived too late to be of any use; but when it did arrive, says Herodotus, it confirmed the result that had already taken place: the snakes stood for the Lydians, for the snake was a γῆς παῖς, a child of the soil, i.e. an indigenous animal, while the horses symbolized the Persians, because the horse was a hostile beast and an incomer. So the Persians were always going to win.[2]

This interpretation was delivered, says the author, before the prophets knew what had happened at Sardis. A likely story. The fact is that the 'official' interpretation only makes sense as a preposterous inversion of the obvious surface meaning of the omen. One would have to label it merely a desperate attempt at face-saving, if one believed in its historicity. Consider the following.

The battle which ensues, as described by Herodotus, is a straight fight between Lydian cavalry and Persian infantry. Horses are Croesus' strong suit, as the ironical parable told by Bias (or Pittacus) at chapter 27 has already emphasized. Cyrus' main worry is, indeed, precisely how to neutralize the Lydian mounted troops; and he comes up with the brilliant stratagem of frightening the horses with camels. No halfway intelligent person confronted with the prodigy could do other than assume that the horses symbolized the Lydians. Conversely, it is the snakes, not the horses, which are the sudden 'new arrival' and which naturally denote the invading Persians, whose strength lay in their infantry—they are 'grounded', then, like snakes—and whose heavy brigades wore scale armour,

[1] See the note on 14. 1 in my commentary on book 3 (forthcoming).

[2] Just as, according to Ruud Gullit (*Observer*, 5 July 1998), 'Beckham was not the reason England went out of the World Cup. The real turning point was the Argentinian equaliser on the stroke of half-time. After that, I'm afraid England were always going to lose.' History is written backwards.

breastplates with overlapping, shiny metal disks, resembling the scales of snakes.[3] So if the horses ate the snakes, who could doubt that the gods were forecasting a Lydian victory?

The exceptional interest of this passage is that it strongly suggests (against the whole trend of the arguments of Detlev Fehling)[4] that a much fuller popular tradition lies behind Herodotus' text, and that the latter can, at least in certain favourable cases, be used to reconstruct the former. The interpretation ascribed to the Telmessian prophets can only be understood as a deliberately perverse, paradoxical, and sophistic reversal of the surface meaning of the omen. A 'normal' telling—the kind of fully elaborated, expansive version which circulated orally, and which Herodotus serves up to us in a briefer edited form—will have described how Croesus was encouraged by the straightforward equation 'horses = Lydians, snakes = Persians', and only later (too late!) discovered that these apparent certainties were capable of being twisted round, by wise-after-the-event soothsayers, to mean precisely the opposite. So why has Herodotus rejected that 'normal' narrative version? Clearly, because he has already used the motif in connection with Croesus' consultation of the Delphic oracle: 'If he attacks the Persians, he will bring down a great empire' (ch. 53), together with the subsequent apologia (ch. 91). *Ex post facto*, it turns out that the empire was not that of Cyrus, but his own. But Herodotus does not want to repeat a routine that he has so recently exploited,[5] so in the second case he simply omits the superficial meaning; rather as the *Odyssey* poet, faced with two stories about giant cannibals, decided to concentrate all his effort on the Polyphemus version, and reduced the Laestrygonian incident to a kind of appendix, a mere sketch of what could otherwise have been a fully expanded treatment.

What does the Lydian omen tell us about the nature of Herodotus' text? First, that it is a legitimate and productive exercise to search behind and beyond the surface for meanings and connec-

[3] 7. 61. 1; cf. 9. 22. 2. The earliest named wearer of this kind of battledress seems to be Goliath (1 Sam. 17: 5); see T. C. Mitchell, *The Bible in the British Museum: Interpreting the Evidence* (London, 1988), 57, illustrating a 7th-cent. Assyrian example.

[4] *Herodotus and his 'Sources': Citation, Invention and Narrative Art* (Leeds, 1989).

[5] While we are on the subject of recycling, note that Croesus had himself assembled, a little earlier, another improbable collocation of mammal and reptile, once more in a context featuring prophecy and comestibility: the lamb and tortoise casserole cooked up in his attempt to confuse the oracles (48. 2).

tions which are unexpressed and remain only potential. Second, that here, at any rate, the author himself seems to be manipulating his material in an artful way, deciding what to present and what to withhold. Nor is this an isolated or exceptional case. Something very similar seems to be going on in the famous *bekos* story which begins book 2. There too half is given, half is suppressed. For surely Herodotus must have known that the results of Psammetichus' experiment were ambiguous: as well as the φύσις interpretation, which he provides, according to which the two babies produced the word for bread from their innate knowledge of the Phrygian, or Chomskian, *Ursprache*, there was a competing and equally valid νόμος-based interpretation, which held that the children were simply imitating the only sounds that they had heard—*bek, bek*, the bleating of the goats. This rivalry between inborn and learned, nature and culture, was absolutely central to intellectual speculation in the later fifth century; Herodotus cannot have been ignorant of the alternative explanation.

So it is a question not only of 'We may extract from him more than he tells' but also 'He knows more than he tells'.

After this preliminary survey we can now proceed towards our main business: that of adjacent passages which I believe to be connected, but connected by invisible bonds. Let me begin with an assurance that such a thing is possible in Greek literature, by citing two examples from early epic.

First, the fable of the Hawk and the Nightingale in Hesiod's *Works and Days*. The fable appears to finish at line 212; in fact some people seem still to believe that Hesiod's message to his audience is that this is a hard world in which Might is Right and the wicked prosper, while all the poor people can do is suffer in silence, or, if they prefer, suffer and squawk. But that would make nonsense of the whole thrust of the poem, whose object is to emphasize the inescapable triumph of Zeus' δίκη. The fable comprises only 'what the kings say', and it is not the whole truth. The consequences of hubristic behaviour continue in what immediately follows, transposed into a different register. When Dike is violated, he goes on, she cries for help (like the nightingale), and punishment inevitably follows—even if it is delayed for a generation or two. So the two contiguous passages must be read together.

Secondly, a famous simile in the *Odyssey*. At 8. 520 Demodocus concludes his song of the Sack of Troy, breaking off at the point

when hand-to-hand street-fighting is taking place. There follows a description of Odysseus' reaction to the recitation, in the form of a simile: he weeps like a woman whose husband has been killed in defence of his city, and who is about to be dragged away into slavery by the victors. So the simile represents the effects of the conquest which Demodocus suppressed—the story is refocalized from Greek men to Trojan women, allowing us to empathize at a subliminal level with the suffering of the defeated inhabitants. The closure is only apparent; the narrative continues on another plane. This is a beautiful sophistication,[6] which shows the kind of demand that could already be made on an audience's attention and intelligence in the seventh century BC; and a good example of the phenomenon whose existence I want to establish in Herodotus too.

Here is the first of my three cases, which I shall present in order of interest and difficulty.

1. *Sex and Medicine in Babylon* (*1. 196–199*)

The Babylonians, says Herodotus, used to regulate the business of marriage through the wholly admirable application of market forces. The pretty girls would be auctioned off first, in order of pulchritude, and the money thus raised was used to finance a reverse auction: 'This one's not too bad looking—who'll take the least money to go off with her?'—until all the girls found husbands and the books, with luck, were balanced. These days, says Herodotus, they've given up this splendid custom and gone to the other extreme—now all the poor people prostitute their daughters.

He reverts to the subject of prostitution a little later, after describing what passes for the Babylonian national health service in ch. 197, and the customs pertaining to burial and marital intercourse, lumped together in ch. 198. In ch. 196 he had opposed excellent past policy with present corruption; now he presents us with a different opposition, 'the foulest custom of the Babylonians' to contrast with 'the finest' that he described before. In fact, all the basic elements of the opening chapter reappear in inverted form. Once again, in this description of the supposed sacred prostitution in Mylitta's temple, women are on public view, and men are making

[6] See H. Rohlich, 'Ein Gleichnis der Odyssee', *A&A* 33 (1987), 45–52.

their selection for the purposes of sex. Each woman must go with the man who pays for her. The difference is that this time money, which lay at the heart of the previous transaction, is utterly irrelevant: the coin which is presented as payment is a mere token, and may be of any value. Conversely unattractiveness, which was no obstacle to marriage in ch. 196, is now crucial: you may sit there for years before being accidentally picked out by some myopic Babylonian male. In short, the text offers us two opposites to the ideal situation which once obtained; the weak and vestigial note at the end of ch. 196, and the fully developed alternative of present-day prostitution.

The whole sequence is neatly tied up in a single package by Herodotus' opening and closing anthropological parallels—the Eneti of Illyria introducing it, the Cypriots rounding it off. It is not a question of being able to accept this bit or that as genuine; it has such a strong internal coherence that it stands or falls as a unit. Could it stand?

As described, the Mylitta cult would have caused a range of problems: unwanted pregnancy, and (if the woman were married) doubts about paternity; crowd control and fights over prior claims to the most attractive women. Could a society ever have institutionalized a practice which entailed such serious social difficulties? Come to that, if every time a married couple made love they had to sit on the bedroom floor facing each other over a pot of incense for the rest of the night (ch. 197), it must have been a powerful incentive to celibacy; otherwise, how did they ever get any sleep, or ever get any work done the following day?

Doubts are compounded when it is realized that the third striking Babylonian custom described by Herodotus, that concerning treatment of the sick in ch. 197, itself looks like a functional transformation of the two complementary sex stories. Sick people are exposed to public view, like the brides and the prostitutes. This time, however, in still a further inversion, the compulsion is not on the static person, the man who is ill, but on the passers-by. Instead of having the freedom to bid or not to bid for a wife, to choose this or that woman in the temple, they are now bound to ask each invalid they pass 'What seems to be the trouble?', and to offer any advice they can; while the bedridden other is presumably free to accept or ignore the prescription. Fixed or mobile, free or forced, choosing or chosen—these seem to be the dynamic oppositions which govern

Babylonian social interactions. Only the married couples, hunched over the incense as they wait for breakfast-time, stand (or rather sit) in a relationship of stable equality; they have made their choice.

So the 'medical' story must also go into the pot. We seem to have the option either of believing that the structural homologies displayed by the three accounts are a product of the working of the story process, spawning new experimental variants as is usual in the folk-tale tradition (or, for that matter in the venerable Italian tradition of Carabinieri jokes); or of accepting that the social system in Babylon was so supremely well integrated that its component parts elegantly mirrored each other in the way Herodotus describes. My money would go on the first option; especially when we note that the marriage-market custom is another very good candidate in support of the notion that current Greek political theory has been transposed into a foreign context. The auction is exactly that proposed by the fifth-century writer Phaleas of Chalcedon. Aristotle tells us in the *Politics* (1266[a] ff.): 'Phaleas affirmed that the citizens of a state ought to have equal possessions . . . and that the shortest way to encompass the desired end would be for *the rich to give and not receive marriage portions, and for the poor not to give but to receive them*.'[7]

The Babylonian material is probably fiction, then, at least in its tripled form; the fantasy of an outsider projecting Greek Utopian theory onto a realm where it can be imagined as reality. Which outsider—Herodotus? This time he is certainly aware of the logical shape of his material, as his explicit contrasts, and the ring-compositional framework, make clear. But the creativity itself may be the result of anonymous popular tradition which he has picked up and transmitted without much personal input. Something rather similar, I think, is going on at the end of book 6. Two stories about great Athenian families sit side by side: the tale of Alcmaeon in Croesus' treasury, and the famous, longer, account of Agariste's wedding.[8] What do they have in common, apart from they fact that they supply complementary *aitia* for the enormous wealth of the Alcmaeonidae? Answer: both anecdotes climax with a memorable image of aristocratic legs in motion. Alcmaeon's legs, weighed down by top-boots crammed with gold dust, shuffling slowly out of the treasury, to the condescending and perhaps contemptuous

[7] See R. A. McNeal, 'The Brides of Babylon: Herodotus 1. 196', *Historia*, 37 (1988), 54–71.

[8] 6. 125, 126–7.

amusement of the Lydian king. And the legs of Hippoclides, light, frisky, upside down in the air, arousing the outrage of the Sicyonian tyrant. The two stories belong together *come pappa e ciccia*. And of course, as Rosalind Thomas says, they are both stories told against the Alcmaeonids.[9]

Because the elements of these last examples were so explicitly parallel, we are not surprised to see a kind of osmotic interchange operating to make them still more like each other. But now I come to two cases which are much less obvious. Like the brides and the prostitutes, and Alcmaeon and Hippoclides, they are essentially paired stories, stories which have grown up together and exist symbiotically, which are inherently bifid. Again a common feature is contiguity in the text. But these are much more interesting and controversial pairs: interesting, because the correspondence between the adjacent stories is concealed at a deeper structural level; controversial, because readers may well dispute that it exists at all, and decide that it is a fantasy of my own making. First, the blind slaves at the beginning of book 4.

2. *Eyeless in Scythia* (*4. 2*)

The Scythians blind all their slaves, and this is connected with the milk they drink. The way they get their milk is as follows. They have blowpipes made out of bones (they look very like our reed-pipes), and while one person inserts one of these pipes into the vagina[10] of the mare and blows into it, someone else is doing the milking. They say that the effect of this is that the mare's veins are pumped up and the udder descends. Once the milk has been extracted, it is poured into deep wooden vessels and then they station their blind slaves around the vessels and have them stir the milk. The milk separates into an upper layer (which is skimmed off and regarded as the best bit) and a lower layer (which is thought to be less good), and that is why the Scythians blind everyone they capture. For they are nomads, not farmers. (trans. Waterfield)

[9] *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens* (Cambridge, 1989), 266 ff. The whole section 103–37 (end of book, and thus of *λόγος*) is an Alcmaeonid-Philaid counterpoint beginning and ending with Miltiades the Philaid. Alcmaeon and Hippoclides are a kind of miniature insert within that larger picture.

[10] *τὰ ἄρθρα*. A. de Sélincourt translates 'anus', and Marincola's revision (1996) lets this stand; but Powell, Legrand, Grene, and Fraschetti all have some version of 'genitals'. We shall see later why, quite apart from the matter of correct Greek, the latter group must be right.

Once again, this is probably in part a projection of Greek tradition on to foreigners: there are well-known stories about Sparta, Taras, and Locri which show the same anxiety about interbreeding between slaves and citizen women.[11] Indeed, this transposition abroad of originally hellenic material, which has already obtruded itself several times, could and perhaps should have been the main theme of the present paper.

This book, then, does not open, in the relaxed manner of book 2, with some genial Scythian Psammetichus conducting a kindergarten experiment that turns out to be a joke against himself and his race; instead, we are presented with a cruel picture of slaves who have their eyes put out as a matter of routine in order to enable them to serve their masters as more efficient producers of hippo-yoghurt.[12]

Or is that the reason? In spite of the confident way in which Herodotus expresses himself ('they blind all their slaves because of the milk which they drink', followed by a description of work in the creamery, summed up by 'this is the reason for their blinding every prisoner they take'), it has not been at all clear to commentators just why the savage treatment Herodotus describes should seem (from the employers' point of view) such a good idea. If your slaves' job consists of milking mares, or inserting tubes into their rear ends and blowing hard, how does lack of vision improve their productivity? Samson was set to grind corn (Judges 16: 21), and his blindness was no obstacle to that simple, monotonous task; this seems a different case. Stein thinks some linguistic misunderstanding may have occurred in the transmission of the story, but others make a valiant attempt at explanation. 'It stops them running away', said Rawlinson, followed (half-heartedly) by Legrand; true, but other slave-owning societies have not found it necessary to resort to such drastic preventative measures. So why should the Scythians? Fitton Brown suggested that blind slaves would never dare to steal the cream because they had no way of telling when the supervisor's eye was on them;[13] an inventive explanation, but I do not believe it.

[11] See S. G. Pembroke, 'Locres et Tarentes: le rôle des femmes dans la fondation de deux colonies grecques', *Annales ESC* 25 (1970), 1240–70.

[12] There is a more detailed description of the process in the Hippocratic corpus: *De semine, de natura pueri, de morbis* 4. 51.

[13] A. D. Fitton Brown, 'Notes on Herodotus and Thucydides', *Hermes*, 86 (1958), 379–82.

Apart from a reference to this 'strange chapter',[14] François Hartog completely ignores the story of the blind slaves in his book on the Scythians in Herodotus. The French mode of discourse operates to best effect when it is allowed a free choice of the texts on which to preach its sermons. But its position at the very beginning of the *λόγος* surely suggests that the story possessed for Herodotus some kind of important, perhaps symbolic, status; at the very minimum, that it was felt to make an effective attention-grabber. It invites a reaction.

Why should Herodotus, or more generally fifth-century Greeks, have thought that it would be appropriate for the Scythians to blind their slaves?

Blinding is regularly associated in Greek thought with sexual offences. We have only to think of Oedipus, Phoenix, and Tiresias. It appears in the myths as a condign punishment for rape or incest because it is an obvious metaphor for castration, a more readily mentionable equivalent of the other, nastier kind of revenge.

We hardly have to look far to find a sex crime for which the slaves of the Scythians might be held to deserve punishment. The grim dairy tale is directly embedded in an account of early Scythian history in which the slaves take advantage of their masters' absence abroad on campaign to sleep with their wives. The absence, and the illicit relationships, continue for so long that by the time the warriors come home a whole new generation of young men, sons of the slaves and the soldiers' wives, has grown up to maturity; and these attempt to oppose the returning Scythians. The next chapter, indeed, is devoted to a description of the way in which proper authority was re-established. Punishment for the errant slaves is an element that we might expect, but do not find, at the explicit surface level of the narrative. Might the blinding be, precisely, that expected retribution?

This explanatory attempt will not 'work', in the simple sense, as a solution to the text put before us by Herodotus, for while he firmly (if obscurely) claims to be offering us reasons for the blinding, punishment for sexual misconduct is certainly not one of them. Further, he explicitly describes the young men who opposed the returning Scyths as 'sons of the blind slaves' (ch. 20); to him, this makes good sense, for this is the first generation of slave children who had ever been in a position to defend their class—they had

[14] *The Mirror of Herodotus* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1988), 18.

their eyes. Herodotus knows no story to account for the beginning of the custom of slave-blinding, or if he does he is not telling. It is presented as a timeless tradition.

I suggest, nevertheless, that the story's material can in fact be shown to contain just the ingredients we need to construct an alternative account, an *aition* of the practice. If we consider the relationship of crime and punishment in Greek thought in rather more general terms, it is evident that tortures are often devised to be specially relevant to the crimes they avenge: they mimic and parody them. Tantalus offended against the food code, and is doomed to starve within reach—almost—of gourmet treats. The Danaids were unsatisfactory brides, and must therefore repeat the housewifely task of water-fetching without end. Sisyphus succeeded, once or even twice, in getting up and out of Hades, so from now on he will always just reach the highest point of renewed hope before falling back, boulder and all, to the bottom of the pit of hell. And Tityos the rapist has the source of his lust, his liver, plucked out from his body by vultures. These examples are drawn from the exemplary punishments of those who violated the human–divine boundary-line; but there is no reason to think that the line between slave and free could not have been defined by the same kind of imagery.

And indeed, the same replicatory, Mosaic justice is surely demonstrable in the case of the naughty slaves. What they did wrong, while their masters were abroad, was to gaze on the nakedness of the Scythian ladies, to fondle their breasts, and to thrust their penises into them.

Since then—as the story is trying (in spite of its author?) to tell us—all Scythian slaves have had to pay the penalty for the pleasures of their archetypal ancestors by recapitulating those original acts in grotesquely caricatured fashion: now they can see nothing at all, and must spend their lives inserting bone tubes into mares' vulvas, blowing air into them (the very image of fruitless labour) and squeezing their udders to extract milk—not for their own enjoyment, but for the delectation of their masters. Like Sisyphus, Ocnus, and other delinquents, their punishment is to languish in the dark performing an unending task which has been tailor-made to remind the criminal, and any potential imitators, of the wages of sin.

What the raw material of this tale seems to want to express, if I can put it like that, is how emblematic, how perfectly appropriate to the crime their punishment really is. Herodotus, presenting it in

'cooked' form, opted for a steady-state explanation of the supposed phenomenon of Scythian slave-blinding; there is a continuing reason for the practice, even if it is never clearly stated. But behind and beyond our author we can discern a different and more satisfying theory which put it all down to a single historical event, a big bang.

In other words, my feeling this time is that Herodotus is operating at several removes from the point at which cause and effect were coherently linked together; that he is an unwitting carrier of the story's original meaning-in-context here. If this is right, Herodotus seems to be subjecting at least some of his raw material to much less cooking than some critics like Detlev Fehling have argued; and we may be more inclined to 'trust' him as a faithful transmitter of popular stories.

But we must be cautious here. Though he shows no sign of realizing the relevance of the slave revolt to the blinding custom, he still keeps the two items together; indeed one is rolled up inside the other. And there are plenty of examples in Herodotus of a recurrent pattern which one might call 'situational irony', where the author makes no comment, even though the context seems to cry out for an explicit remark on two juxtaposed items. For example:

7. 3. Demaratus, exiled king of Sparta, is made to advise Xerxes on the problems of the Persian succession. Who better to call in about a question of disputed legitimacy than Demaratus, who had himself been deposed from one of the Lacedaemonian thrones because of allegedly doubtful parentage?

8. 104. Hermotimus the eunuch is appointed escort and guardian of Xerxes' children. Hermotimus' own life story is then recounted; having been emasculated by a slave-dealer as a child, he finally ran across the man who had ruined his life again, tricked him into bringing his family along, forced him to castrate his own children, then forced the children to castrate their father. Some *παιδαγωγός*!

5. 21. After a lurid melodrama in which visiting Persians are slaughtered en masse for having been too familiar with the daughters of their Macedonian hosts, Herodotus reports neutrally that Alexander the Macedonian king then married his daughter to a Persian noble.

In none of these cases does Herodotus draw attention to the ironies implicit in the relation of frame to story, though he is surely aware of them. Nor, for that matter, does he give the slightest hint

that he has shaped the concluding episodes of the whole work—in particular that of Xerxes and the wife of Masistes—so that they form a mirror image of the beginning—Gyges and Candaules, and so on. We have to make the connection ourselves, just as we do when we hear a triumphant tragic chorus and know intuitively that disaster will immediately follow. Or just as we do when we move on from the Melian dialogue to the magnificent departure for Sicily of the Athenian Grand Fleet. Often, it seems, ancient texts were of a kind that Plato ought to have approved of:[15] not closed and final, but mere starting-points for reflection, for work which the reader still has to do.

With this still unresolved *aporia*—is Herodotus aware of the significance of the material he transmits, or is he sometimes no more than a fax machine?—let us move on to my last example, the story of the great Asian lake.

3. *The Watergate Crisis* (*3. 117*)

At this point in book 3 Herodotus seems to be rounding off his long survey of the Persian satrapies which Darius inherited, and is represented as reorganizing, on seizing power; this, with its associated digressions, had occupied him ever since ch. 90. We now come to this:

> There is in Asia a plateau surrounded on all sides by a solid wall of mountains, broken only by five gorges. This plateau used to form part of the territory of the Chorasmians, and formed the boundary between them and the Hyrcanians, Parthians, Sarangae, and Thamanaeans; however, now that the Persians are in power, it belongs to the Persian king. Now, a sizeable river called the Aces rises in the mountains which surround this plateau. This river used to divide into five sub-rivers, each of which passed through one of the gorges and provided water for the land of one of the tribes just mentioned. But now that the Persians are in control of the plateau, the rivers have been treated as follows: the Persian king dammed up the gorges through the mountains and built sluice-gates in each gorge to prevent the water escaping; with no way for the water to get out of the plateau once it has flowed in, the mountain-locked plateau has become a sea. This has caused a great deal of suffering among the tribes, because they used to rely on this water, and now they cannot use it. It is all right in the winter, when

[15] *Phdr.* 274 B 6 ff.

the god sends rain on to their land as he does everywhere else, but in the summer when they are planting their millet and sesame, they need water. Since they receive no supply of water, they make the journey to Persia, taking their wives with them, and there they stand at the entrance to the king's palace and howl loudly and bitterly. The king then gives orders that the sluice-gates blocking the river which flows into the territory of the tribe which pleads most forcefully are to be opened, and when their land has soaked up enough water to become saturated, these gates are closed, and he gives the order for the next most desperate pleaders to have their sluice-gates opened. My information is that he opens the gates only after he has extracted from them a great deal of money, over and above their regular tribute. (trans. Waterfield, slightly modified)

Taken in isolation, this is a baffling passage. No historian or archaeologist has yet found a geomorphological configuration in the landscape of the eastern empire to correspond to Herodotus' description: a plain watered by a large river, surrounded by mountains, and issuing forth to five separate nations through five separate gorges, each of which is capable of being blockaded at the will of the controlling power. Surely by now satellite surveys would have identified this great ancient Aswan High Dam project, if it had ever existed. What is more, it makes no sense. By the time the distressed Chorasmians, say, having decided they were getting short of water and needed to petition the king, had collected their women and got halfway to Susa, their crops would long have been parched to a frazzle; let alone by the time the king had prioritized their needs and some official key-holder had returned to unlock the sluices.

Herodotus continues: *ταῦτα μὲν δὴ ἔχει οὕτω*, 'Well, that's enough about that', and proceeds in ch. 118 to resume the thread of his narrative of the early days of Darius' reign. He passes immediately to the story of Intaphernes, Darius' ex-fellow conspirator in the plot against the Magi who challenged his new boss's authority and was executed along with his sons and other male relations; the high point of the story of course being Darius' relenting in the face of the lamentations of Intaphernes' wife to the extent of allowing her to save a single member of the family, and his astonishment at her choice of her brother.

It appears, then, that the junction between ch. 117 and ch. 118 marks the conclusion of one structural unit and the beginning of a different one. At one level of analysis, this is undeniable; there is a clear change of subject and of direction. What I should like

to suggest is that, quite regardless of this surface dynamic, there is a different logic at work that does not divide the two chapters but connects them in an intimate reciprocity. We have another responding pair. Consider the similarities:

Chapter 117 describes the general power of Persian kings: water, the source of all fertility for surrounding regions, has been privatized since the Persian takeover and is locked away behind an impenetrable barrier of mountains; it is under the absolute control of the king, and may be released to his subjects through the 'gates' (*πυ̂λαι*) by his arbitrary decision when they and their wives stand outside his palace in supplication.

Chapter 118 deals with the specific power of the new King Darius: the centralized authority on which the whole empire depends is hidden away behind the stone walls of the palace; great stress is laid by Herodotus on Darius' decision to remain incomunicado inside his royal compound. When Intaphernes challenges this power he and his sons are locked away inside the walls, and his wife has to stand supplicating outside the doors (*θυ̂ραι*) until it is the king's pleasure to hear her.

So there is a clear general similarity between the two adjacent sections; both dwell on the King's absolute authority to confine and release across the boundary of his power-base according to his whim. And we are all familiar with the possibilities that the water cycle offers for images of beneficence. 'The quality of mercy is not strain'd, it droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven.' It droppeth, according to Herodotus (but is Herodotus aware of it? He does not let on, he certainly does not make it explicit), it droppeth into the king's private reservoir, and he decideth whether or not to open the sluices and let it out to his subjects. In the case of Intaphernes' wife, he decideth to let her have a small ration.

But there is more:

Chapter 117 (general): the nations over whom the Persian king exercises this arbitrary power are five in number.

Chapter 118 (specific): the Persian nobles over whom Darius is determined at precisely this point to assert his regal authority are also five in number. The conspirators who deposed the Magi were originally seven. Otanes withdrew from contention once monarchy was decided upon (ch. 84). Darius became king, and the whole point of the story of Intaphernes' wife is that Darius must now distance

himself from his five remaining former cronies and establish himself as a being of an altogether higher order. That is why Intaphernes must be made an example of, *pour encourager les autres*. And in this light we can also see that as well as the obvious symmetry 'wives beg the king to release what they want from within the walls' there is also an inverse homology: in the first story, the five sluice-gates are barred to prevent water getting out; in the second, the palace gates are barred to prevent the king's five former comrades from getting in.

I suggest, then, that these two superficially different stories are nothing more than reflexes of each other. Chapter 117 prepares the way, so to speak, for the pattern of ch. 118; it is a kind of allegorical overture to the main theme, a hydrological metaphor for what is surely the central subject of interest, Persian *Machtpolitik*. The story appears twice, first in code and then *en clair*; they are esoteric and exoteric equivalents, as it were. 'When the Persians gained control' (ch. 117) corresponds to 'When Darius gained control' in the immediately following chapter; 'formerly, when the water flowed freely to all five nations' (ch. 117) expresses the situation that obtained between the coup and Darius' assumption of supreme power, when all members of the junta still enjoyed equal rights. What kind of conscious narrative skill or deep structural shaping processes lie behind this phenomenon I will not presume (at this stage) to analyse; a simple possibility might be that in some previous telling the 'Watergate story' was told in the course of the Intaphernes story as an explicit parable, and that the two have become dissociated, but not separated, in the course of their onward transmission to Herodotus' text.

The fact that they still stand side by side suggests that the decoupling was a very recent event; yet in view of the fact that the text (119. 1) talks of six rivals (thus including Otanes) rather than the five which the symmetry requires, it hardly seems likely that the author himself was aware of the complementary nature of the pair of stories. Perhaps the story of the rivers circulated rather as an implicit, coded, anti-monarchical fable in Persia; Herodotus heard it in connection with its real-life referent, the Intaphernes story, but failed to get the point. On the other hand, it might be felt that the correspondence of the five comrades with the five gates suggests

the influence of the Theban legend, implying Greek input if not Greek invention.

I am still not finished with ch. 117. It is difficult to find any obvious reason for its standing where it does. How would Herodotus have justified his decision to put it there? Hard to say. But not only, in my view, does it play a forward-looking role, leading into the Intaphernes story; it is a perfect bridge passage, for it is also excellently designed to conclude what had preceded. The previous pages had been taken up with the tribute, as reorganized by Darius; all the subject nations, from each according to his means, were bound to send their economic surplus to the centre of the empire. And wealth is regularly symbolized in ancient texts as a great pool of wealth dammed up inside a city.[16] So we can explain the function of this chapter to our general satisfaction. But Herodotus has not made it easy for us.

At all events: if we take this case, and the one of the Scythian slaves, together, the pattern is the same: we are told about a generic, timeless practice ('begging for water'; 'blinding slaves to milk horses') before we turn to an alleged single, historical incident ('Intaphernes' wife'; 'revolt of the slaves'). Both are reminiscent of the way a parable or a fable precedes its application—puzzling until the relevance is explained. But no explanation is forthcoming. The linkage seems broken.

The business of putting these thoughts on paper has made me decidedly less inclined to see Herodotus as Fehling's omni-inventor. What is striking in the last two cases is that though the pairs of related material stand side by side in the text, each depending on the other, Herodotus seems to have no awareness of their structural relationship or significance. If he had been (substantially) a reworker of this material, he would (wouldn't he?) have made it (*a*) neater—the fives and sixes would have been co-ordinated—and (*b*) more explicit. The earlier series of passages where the historian refrains from ironical comment where irony is implicit will hardly cover these cases.

The conclusion seems to be that at least on occasion he is a transmitter of messages encoded at a more primitive level by (for want of a better expression) the 'mythic process'; or, less mysteri-

[16] That is why the draining of the Alban Lake can act as a symbol of the capture and emptying of the rich city of Veii, in a passage whose dominant metaphor echoes the one discussed here; see Livy 5. 16 ff.

ously, by generations of taletellers to whom connections of this kind 'came naturally' and were part of their narrative tool kit. One thinks of Hesiod, who passes on, but surely did not invent, the series of inside–outside contrasts which run through the story of Prometheus and Pandora (sacrifice; fennel stick; first woman; pithos).[17]

To paraphrase what was said of Marx:[18] 'There is no such thing as an innocent reading of Herodotus; the only question is, of which reading are you guilty?' I hope I have at least made it clear that my reading is one in which the play of narrative at several levels—in its free, wild state, in its use as propaganda, in its manipulation by an author in the service of his own ends—deserves scrutiny and understanding for its own sake, and indeed cannot be used as raw material for the composition of history books until it is given the close attention it demands. At any rate, if the connections outlined here are valid, they reinforce the impression gained elsewhere from a reading of Herodotus—that this is a curiose and ingeniose text which requires (and repays) what can only be called a process of laborious decipherment.[19]

[17] See the classic article by J.-P. Vernant, 'The Myth of Prometheus in Hesiod', in *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece* (Brighton, 1980), 168–85.

[18] L. Althusser, *Reading* Capital (London, 1970), 14–15.

[19] Perhaps I should explain my title: 'kissing', as a pair of snooker balls touch each other; 'cousins', in the sense 'related, but not obviously'. American informants claim familiarity with the phrase, but disagree as to its meaning.

9

The Herodotean Picture of Themistocles: A Mirror of Fifth-century Athens

WOLFGANG BLÖSEL

It has long been accepted that Herodotus' views on Athens, in particular the Athens of his contemporaries, are a key for understanding his *Histories*. Although the position which Jacoby made canonical, namely that Herodotus venerates Athens,[1] has for many years remained unchallenged, Strasburger more than forty years ago showed that in numerous passages Herodotus presents the Athenians in a bad light.[2] Quite recently Stadter in fact demonstrated that Herodotus criticizes the Athenians as the Persians' direct successors in the collection of tribute from the Ionians.[3] In an important recent article Moles convincingly argued that

I should like to thank Dr Nino Luraghi for his kind invitation to the workshop. This paper presents a summary of my as yet unpublished dissertation *Themistokles bei Herodot: Spiegel Athens im fünften Jahrhundert. Studien zur historiographischen Konstruktion einer geschichtlichen Figur* (Heidelberg, 1997). As always, I owe thanks to Prof. Fritz Gschnitzer, my Doktorvater. Dr Victor Parker (Christchurch, New Zealand) undertook to translate my remarks into English, for which I thank him heartily. I wish also to thank Prof. Hans-Joachim Gehrke, Dr Nino Luraghi, Dr Oswyn Murray, Prof. Luigi Enrico Rossi, and Dr Ralf Scharf for their criticism of my paper. None bears any blame for remaining errors.

[1] F. Jacoby, 'Herodotos', *RE* suppl ii (1913), 205–520. Cf. the recent article of J. C. Carrière, 'Oracles et prodiges de Salamine: Hérodote et Athènes', *DHA* 14 (1988), 219–75, esp. 249–65.

[2] H. Strasburger, 'Herodot und das perikleische Athen', *Historia*, 4 (1955), 1–25 at 21–2. Note his comments on the speech of the Corinthian Sosicles (5. 92) and on the excursus concerning the Alcmaeonids (6. 121–31).

[3] P. A. Stadter, 'Herodotus and the Athenian *Arche*', *ASNP*[3] 22 (1992), 781–809, especially concerning the alleged validity of the Persians' assessment of the Ionians' tribute from 493 down to the Periclean period (Hdt. 6. 42).

Herodotus' placing of Solon's exchange with Croesus at the very beginning of the *Histories* (1. 29–33) is intended as a programmatic admonition to the Athenians: the historian wishes in his own person to issue a warning to the Athenians against the fatal consequences of power left to grow unchecked.[4]

That historians—whether consciously or unconsciously—reflect the present in their depiction of the past is by now a commonplace. None the less, no one, despite Raaflaub's encouragement,[5] has ever carried out a systematic analysis of those portions of Herodotus' work which deal primarily with the fully historical period. As I hope to show in these remarks, Herodotus inserted references to the present not only into the fictional material but into the historical as well.

We must also be aware of other distortions. E. Badian, in a trailblazing study on Herodotus' methods of characterization, has shown that Herodotus by literary means turned inside out the apologetic stories which had originally served to prove the Macedonian king's philhellenism in order to expose that king's calculating duplicity.[6] The best example, however, of such contamination, or, if one will, invention directed towards criticizing the mighty, in this case the Athenians, may be found in the series of anecdotes constructed around the Athenian general and statesman Themistocles.[7]

[4] J. Moles, 'Herodotus Warns the Athenians', in F. Cairns and M. Heath (eds.), *Roman Poetry and Prose, Greek Poetry, Etymology, Historiography* (Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar, 9; Leeds, 1996), 259–84.

[5] K. A. Raaflaub, 'Herodotus, Political Thought, and the Meaning of History', *Arethusa*, 20 (1987), 221–47 at 235, 237: 'How can we be sure that such retrojection of terms and ideas [sc. by the historian from the present into the past] is not "innocently" intended to "flesh out" the historical narrative and make it more plausible but rather purposely designed to reveal the topical relevance of history?' A. French, 'Topical Influences on Herodotus' Narrative', *Mnemosyne*[4], 25 (1972), 9–27, already saw that by the analogies with the Samian revolt of 440/39 at 3. 44 and 3. 120–39 and the Euboeans' defection in 446 at 5. 74. 2 and 5. 77 Herodotus intended to praise Athens as the guarantor of Greek freedom.

[6] E. Badian, 'Herodotus on Alexander I of Macedon: A Study in Some Subtle Silences', in S. Hornblower (ed.), *Greek Historiography* (Oxford, 1994), 107–30 at 121: 'But he [sc. Herodotus] has used his literary art to guide the reader to what seemed to him a just verdict on Alexander's duplicity by stylistic and compositional devices that provide as good examples as can be found of his skill and sophistication. The technique deserves detailed investigation in other contexts.'

[7] For a literary analysis of the anecdotes cf. K. Goldscheider, *Die Darstellung des Themistokles bei Herodot* (diss. Freiburg, 1965), and E. H. Schulte, *Herodots Darstellung der großen griechischen Feldherren* (*in ihrer Bedeutung für seine Geschichtsauffassung*) (diss. Marburg, 1966), 68–125.

A curious ambivalence characterizes Herodotus' tales about him: we see Themistocles now as upright champion of Greek liberty, now as unscrupulous egoist. Hitherto scholars have usually thought that those anecdotes which present Themistocles negatively in large part come from a source opposed to him, in particular the Alcmaeonids grouped around Pericles.[8] In keeping with his motto λέγειν τὰ λεγόμενα,[9] Herodotus has merely repeated what he heard from them. Nevertheless, the thesis that Herodotus inserted verbatim into his work stories current in his day still fails to explain the mutual presence in the *Histories* of anecdotes diametrically opposed to each other. This concurrence cannot stem from the tendentious types of anecdotes which were bandied about e.g. at symposia; one need only think of the scurrilously defamatory doggerel Alcaeus directs at the tyrants of Lesbos; or of the aspersions which Timocreon of Rhodes casts on Themistocles.[10] No; while Herodotus' tales do not condemn Themistocles utterly, neither do they praise him without exception. Rather, not only do they know the white and the black, but they are quite familiar with all the intermediate shades of grey as well. This mixture of contrary opinions must in my view be a result of Herodotus' shaping of the source material available to him. For reconstructing his oral sources three principles seem to me important. First, oral sources evince partisanship. Second, owing to their partisanship they often reveal their place of origin. Finally, they usually have an aetiological function, i.e. they provide an explanation of why something happened in a certain, not necessarily predictable, way.

Let us begin with the anecdotes concerning Themistocles' actions at Cape Artemisium during the summer of 480 (Hdt. 8. 4–5).

[8] e.g. Ed. Meyer, *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte*, i (Halle a. d. Saale, 1892), 198; Jacoby 'Herodotos' [n. 1], 458, 462; L. Piccirilli, 'Temistocle εὐεργέτης dei Corciresi', *ASNP*[3] 3 (1973), 319–55 at 344–7; A. Podlecki, *The Life of Themistocles: A Critical Survey of the Literary and Archaeological Evidence* (Montreal and London, 1975), 67–72; D. Gillis, *Collaboration with the Persians* (*Historia* Einzelschriften, 34; Wiesbaden, 1979), 53–8; G. Cresci Marrone, 'Temistocle e la "vigilia" dell'impero', in L. Braccesi (ed.), *Tre studi su Temistocle* (Padua, 1986), 113–32 at 121–4.

[9] On the actual function of this phrase as a disclaimer see S. Flory, *The Archaic Smile of Herodotus* (Detroit, 1987), 62–79. The question of Herodotus' source citations is not germane to this paper.

[10] Alcaeus frr. 70, 332, 348 Lobel–Page. Timocreon fr. 1 Diehl=727 Davies. See E. S. Stehle, 'Cold Meats: Timokreon on Themistokles', *AJPh* 115 (1994), 507–24 at 522; W. Rösler, 'Mnemosyne in the Symposion', in O. Murray (ed.), *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposion* (Oxford, 1990), 230–7; and O. Vox, 'Bacchilide e Timocreonte contro Temistocle', *Prometheus*, 10 (1984), 117–20.

At first glance Themistocles seems to be the very backbone of the Greek resistance against the Persians. After all, it is he who can persuade the Greeks, who had already decided on retreat in the face of the gargantuan Persian fleet, to remain in spite of this and to meet the invaders off the northern coast of Euboea. Nevertheless, his motives are anything but heroic: according to Herodotus, Themistocles takes the initiative only when the Euboeans offer him thirty talents to protect their property; this the Greek commander, Eurybiades of Sparta, had categorically refused to do. We must recall that the Euboeans had not offered Eurybiades any money to fight off Artemisium. Of the thirty talents they have given to him, Themistocles passes five on to Eurybiades; and with a further three talents he wins over the recalcitrant Corinthian commander Adimantus by telling him that this sum is greater than what the Persian king would give him to leave the Greeks in the lurch.[11] It is Themistocles himself whom Herodotus makes speak of the possible bribing of a Greek general.

Hitherto scholars have assumed that these financial transactions reflect the Euboeans' payment of the Greek army for guarding their island.[12] Yet this view seems to me misguided. First, we have no evidence that civilian troops as early as the beginning of the fifth century received payments in coin.[13] Second, it is hardly credible that the Euboean cities Chalcis, Eretria, and Styra would have paid the other Greeks such a large sum, since according to Herodotus (8. 1) they themselves with twenty-nine triremes participated in the defence against the Persians. The Euboeans were already burdened enough with the provisioning of the Greek troops; besides, it was not just Euboea but Attica as well which was being defended at Cape Artemisium. But it is from the Histiaeans, who comprised by far the largest and most powerful community in northern Euboea

[11] Hdt. 8. 5. 2 *οὐ σύ γε ἡμέας ἀπολείψεις, ἐπεί τοι ἐγὼ μέζω δῶρα δώσω ἢ βασιλεὺς ἄν τοι ὁ Μήδων πέμψειε ἀπολιπόντι τοὺς συμμάχους*.

[12] Cf. M. B. Wallace, 'Herodotos and Euboia', *Phoenix*, 28 (1974), 22–44 at 24–9 and 41–3, and Y. Garlan, *Guerre et économie en Grèce ancienne* (Paris, 1989), 42–50. Phaenias of Eresus fr. 24 Wehrli = Plut. *Them*. 7. 6–7 seems to be the only source for this. According to him, Themistocles gave from the Euboean payment just one talent to a single Athenian trierarch for payment of his troops. On the improbabilities of this story cf. F. J. Frost, *Plutarch's* Themistocles*: A Historical Commentary* (Princeton, 1980), ad loc.

[13] Cf. W. K. Pritchett, *Ancient Greek Military Practice*, i (Berkeley, 1971), 7–14, and V. Gabrielsen, *Financing the Athenian Fleet: Public Taxation and Social Relations* (Baltimore, 1994), 110–11.

and on whose doorstep the sea battle took place, that we really should expect some sort of activity on the Greeks' behalf. The complete absence of the Histiaeans from the Greek fleet—as well as from the Serpent Column at Delphi—can in my opinion be satisfactorily explained only through their Medism or at the very least through a pro-Persian neutrality on their part.[14] Since they were not Ionians as the other Euboeans, in joining the Persians' side they may have been following the example of their tribal kinsmen, the Thessalians.[15] The notice in 8. 23 that it was a Histiaean who told the Persians of the Greek fleet's retreat, but that the Persians plundered the territory of Histiaea anyway, is in my view nothing other than an apologetic fiction: the Medizing of the Histiaeans is here projected onto a Histiaean informant of the Persians as a kind of scapegoat.[16] Herodotus' total suppression of the putative Medizing of the Histiaeans will be of great importance for us later on. For the moment, however, the tale of the 'bribing' of the Greek generals still awaits an explanation.

It is the alleged result of the sea battle which gives us further insight into this tale's genesis. The Greeks, according to Herodotus (8. 14, 16, 18), suffered fewer losses than the Persians and were able to recover their dead and to salvage their wrecks: a generally accepted sign of victory. Furthermore, since the Greeks retreated from Cape Artemisium only after they had learnt of the fall of Thermopylae, it is they whom we must regard as the true victors in the battle at sea.[17] The view that the Athenians themselves thought so too finds confirmation in Pindar and Simonides.[18] Conversely, Herodotus' statement that the Greeks decided on retreat immediately after the battle at Artemisium can be trusted just as little as his similarly phrased statements concerning the

[14] As already suspected by B. D. Meritt, H. T. Wade-Gery, and M. F. McGregor, *The Athenian Tribute Lists*, iii (Princeton, 1950), 99 n. 21.

[15] On this see F. Geyer, 'Histiaia', *RE* suppl. iv (1924), 749–57 at 750–1.

[16] Moreover, in the almost certainly fictional episode which follows—the inspection by Xerxes' troops of the fallen at Thermopylae—Herodotus (8. 24–5) emphasizes that the crews could safely leave their ships in Histiaea and cross over in large numbers to the mainland in boats (*πλοῖα*), since they knew that the Histiaeans would protect the ships.

[17] Cf. C. Hignett, *Xerxes' Invasion of Greece* (Oxford, 1963), 191–2. On Herodotus' distortion of battle descriptions see J. Dillery, 'Reconfigure the Past: Thyrea, Thermopylae and Narrative Patterns in Herodotus', *AJPh* 117 (1996), 217–54.

[18] Pind. fr. 77 Snell–Maehler and Simon. fr. 109 Diehl = fr. xxiv Page. Cf. Lys. 2. 31; Plut. *De Hdt. mal.* 34, 867 B–868 A.

Greeks in northern Thessaly, at Thermopylae, and even just before the battle of Salamis. The Greeks' permanent desire to retreat in the face of the overwhelming superiority of the Persian forces[19] is a Herodotean topos, the literary purpose of which is to emphasize all the more strongly the miraculous salvation vouchsafed at Salamis.

Neither for Herodotus nor for his contemporaries does the correct explanation of the Greeks' retreat seem to have been of relevance, namely that the Greek fleet off Artemisium had been compelled to withdraw thence by the Persians' breakthrough at Thermopylae, which deprived the base at Artemisium of all utility and raised the spectre of the Greeks' retreat being cut off by the Persian army's further advances. Rather, the Greeks of later decades seem to have constructed another explanation for the withdrawal, to all appearances inexplicable, of a fleet after victory. For the Greeks Themistocles, after he absconded to Argos (after 471) and certainly after his flight to Persia *c.*465, had become the archetypal traitor; and they could have combined this view of him with the Medism of the Histiaeans to produce the following piece of slander: the Medizing Histiaeans had given Themistocles a hefty bribe to persuade the Greeks, although victorious, to retreat. Such a tale seems to me to lie at the heart of Herodotus' version of the Euboean payments to Themistocles. The Athenians may be viewed as the prime candidates for the originators of this calumny, especially after the Histiaeans massacred an Athenian ship's crew during the Euboean revolt of 446.[20]

This admittedly speculative reconstruction decisively gains credibility when we realize what motives Herodotus had for radically altering the story told to him. His primary goal is evident: his story aims to acquit Themistocles of the charge of treason. To this end he turned the story's plot right round: Themistocles now receives the money not after, but before, the battle; and the money is not to induce the Greeks to retreat, but quite the contrary, to make them stand fast against the Persians. These alterations transform the avaricious traitor into the champion of liberty.

Likewise the story of the butchering of the Euboeans' stock serves to whitewash Themistocles (Hdt. 8. 19). He is said immediately after the battle to have recommended that the Greeks slaughter the

[19] Hdt. 7. 173. 4, 183. 1, 207, 219. 2; 8. 4. 2, 18, 49. 2, 56, 57. 2, 74. 2, 75. 2.
[20] Thuc. 1. 114. 3; Plut. *Per.* 23. 4.

stock[21] and light fires. Why the Euboeans have conveniently driven their herds to beaches near the battle site remains unexplained and casts doubt on the entire story.[22] Herodotus cannot have thought that the Euboeans meant to supply the Greek squadron with fresh meat, since he describes the loss of their stock as a 'great misfortune'.[23] While a provisioning of the troops might well be the historical reality at the bottom of the account, such provisions will not have taken place only after the battle and certainly not after the decision to retreat. The decisive factor is Themistocles' unhesitating breach of his promise to defend the Euboeans despite the thirty talents they gave him for this very purpose. This breach serves Herodotus' literary ends, since he wishes to present Themistocles as totally unswerving in his true loyalties: here he is solely devoted to the welfare of the fleet.

This sense of service on the part of Themistocles towards his fellow warriors is underscored by comparison of the Herodotean anecdote with its literary foil: the sacrilege of Odysseus' companions against Helios' cattle in the *Odyssey* (12. 260–425). Odysseus and Themistocles are the antitheses of one another: heaven-sent sleep prevents Odysseus from stopping his companions' slaughter of the cattle and from rescuing them from the inevitable divine punishment, their death.[24] Themistocles, by contrast, is in fact the one who goads the Greeks into seizing the Euboeans' stock, thereby breaking his word to them. The fires necessary for cooking the flesh also serve to trick the Persians into thinking the Greeks are remaining at their posts, especially since the former thought that they themselves had been beaten.[25] This stratagem, *ψευδόπυρα*,[26] by means of which Themistocles secures his companions' retreat,

[21] *πρόβατα* (8. 19) includes large livestock such as cattle, as well as small livestock such as sheep and goats.

[22] When danger threatened, all stock was immediately brought to safety. See Aen. Tact. 10. 1; H. Müller, '*Φυγῆς ἕνεκεν*', *Chiron*, 5 (1975), 129–56, esp. 147.

[23] Hdt. 8. 20. 1 *περιπετέα*;8. 20. 2 *συμφορῇ . . . πρὸς τὰ μέγιστα*.

[24] Tiresias had warned Odysseus against the sacrilege (Hom. *Od*. 11. 106–15, esp. 110–11 *τὰς* [sc. *βόας*] | *εἰ μέν κ' ἀσινέας ἐάᾳς νόστου τε μέδηαι,* | *καί κεν ἔτ' εἰς Ἰθάκην κακά περ πάσχοντες ἵκοισθε*). The word *ἀσινέας* connects both scenes: Themistocles simply must butcher the stock so that the Greeks may retreat without loss (Hdt. 8. 19. 1 *ὥστε ἀσινέας ἀπικέσθαι ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα*); the oracle of Bacis (on which see below) provides the divine legitimation for this and transforms Themistocles into the unwitting executor of the gods' judgement upon the Euboeans.

[25] Cf. Hdt. 8. 14. 1; 16. 3; 23. 1; 76. 2.

[26] This stratagem is attested by Frontinus 1. 5. 24; 2. 5. 17; Polyaenus 4. 18. 2; Onasander 10. 13.

probably represents the core of the story, which inspired Herodotus to write up the anecdote of the herds' slaughter.[27]

Having considered separately the accounts of the bribing of the generals and the slaughter of the livestock, we can see clearly that praise for Themistocles dominates both. If, however, we take both anecdotes together, then our evaluation is radically altered. They illuminate two sides of one coin, namely the Delian League. For in the Delian League, as in Herodotus' account of Themistocles' bribery, the Euboeans (like all the other members of the league) paid the Athenians large sums of money—formally at least for protection from the Persians. It can hardly be coincidence that the reassessment decree of 425/4 puts the *φόρος* of the Euboean cities at exactly 31 talents and 100 drachmas.[28] Herodotus could have obtained his figure of thirty talents given by the Euboeans to Themistocles by rounding off the figure listed in the reassessment decree. At this point let me add that I am proceeding on the assumption that the *Histories* were published at the earliest about the end of the 420s.[29] Now, since husbandry was for the Euboeans their main source of income—the name of the island was explained in antiquity as meaning 'rich in cattle'[30]—we are entitled to regard the Euboeans' stock as Herodotean shorthand for their most precious property: exactly that property which they are trying to protect by bribing Themistocles. But if the Athenians in the 420s had heard that Themistocles himself had fallen upon the stock with which the Euboeans had entrusted him, their faces must have turned red with shame, for during the first years of the Peloponnesian war it was to Euboea that they had brought their own stock for safety.[31]

It is through Themistocles' slaughter of their flocks that the Euboeans suffer the same fate which befell most members of the Delian League, as the history of the Pentecontaetia clearly shows: despite

[27] Schulte, *Herodots Darstellungen der großen griechischen Feldherren* [n. 7], 94 even claims that Herodotus had no other information than the oracle of Bacis.

[28] *IG* i³. 71, 1. 67–93. The Carystians' five talents are not included in this sum because they served on the Persians' side throughout Xerxes' campaign; cf. Hdt. 8. 66. 2 and 8. 112. 2.

[29] So C. W. Fornara, 'Evidence for the Date of Herodotus' Publication', *JHS* 91 (1971), 25–34; id., 'Herodotus' Knowledge of the Archidamian War', *Hermes*, 109 (1981), 149–56, *contra* J. Cobet, 'Wann wurde Herodots Darstellung der Perserkriege publiziert?', *Hermes*, 105 (1977), 2–27.

[30] Cf. Hesiod fr. 296 MW; *Etymologicum Magnum*, s.v. *Εὔβοια*.

[31] Thuc. 2. 14. 1. In addition, Attica at the time depended on Euboea as a source of foodstuffs; cf. Thuc. 7. 28. 1; 8. 96. 1–2.

their payments to Athens, they suffered terribly at her hands; for not only did the Athenians give up their role as the guarantors of Greek liberty—a role which they had chosen for themselves and for which they were so richly compensated by the tribute—but they also took from their subjects the one possession which they had hoped to preserve through payment of the tribute: their autonomy. For Thucydides' contemporaries Euboea was, after all, the perfect example of Athens' oppression.[32]

Not only does Herodotus have in his sights the principal mechanisms for fleecing the allies when he recounts Themistocles' activities at Cape Artemisium, but he has in mind as well one particular repressive measure of the Athenians. During the Euboean revolt in 446 a Peloponnesian army[33] under King Pleistoanax of Sparta invaded Attica. This incursion forced Pericles to recall the Athenian troops sent out to Euboea to quash the rebellion. Ephorus and Plutarch report that Pericles nevertheless engineered Pleistoanax's withdrawal by bribing his adviser Cleandridas with ten talents.[34] Thus Pericles bought himself enough time to reconquer Euboea. Since he took the ten talents from the Athenian Treasury,[35] most of whose funds at this time consisted of the allies' tributes, the Euboeans ironically helped to finance their own reconquest. Thus, in this case too we have a sort of 'double bribe': an Athenian general receives money from the Euboeans, part of which he gives to a Spartan general in order to have a free hand against the selfsame Euboeans.

The parallels between Herodotus' account of the year 480 and the events of 446 continue. The inscription regulating the reincorporation of Chalcis into the league after the revolt[36] contains the detail that sacrifices of animals should be made 'in accordance

[32] Thuc. 4. 92. 4; 6. 76. 2. In 424/3 the Athenians again engaged in a punitive expedition against the Euboeans; cf. Philochorus *FGrHist* 328 F 130, and *IG* i³. 418.

[33] Note that Corinthians were present in this army (Thuc. 1. 114. 2).

[34] Ephorus *FGrHist* 70 F 193, and Plut. *Per*. 22–3. Ar. *Nub*. 859 already refers to this. Herodotus might have learnt about these transactions from Cleandridas himself, since both lived for many years in Thurii (Thuc. 6. 104. 2; Polyaenus 2. 10. 1–4).

[35] Ephorus *FGrHist* 70 F 193 *πολλῶν ὄντων χρημάτων ἐν τῇ ἀκοπόλει*. Even the generals at Artemisium thought (as Herodotus 8. 5. 3 emphasizes) that the money which Themistocles passed on to them had come from Athens expressly for this purpose.

[36] *IG* i³. 40. 64–9 *τὰ δὲ hιερὰ τὰ ἐκ τôν χρεσμôν hυπὲρ Εὐβοίας θῦσαι ὁς τάχιστα μετὰ hιεροκλέος τρῆς ἄνδρας, hὸς ἂν ἕλεται hε βολὲ σφôν αὐτôν· hόπος δ' ἂν τάχιστα τυθêι, hοι στρατεγοὶ συνεπιμελόσθον καὶ τὸ ἀργύριον ἐς ταῦτα [π]αρεχόντον*.

with the oracles about Euboea'; the *χρησμολόγος* Hierocles and three members of the Athenian boule were responsible for carrying out the sacrifices, while the Athenian *στρατηγοί* were to provide the necessary monies. On the basis of the similar role of the *στρατηγοί*, I am tempted to see in Themistocles' butchering of livestock an allusion to this sacrifice, which in fact probably took place near Cape Artemisium, site of the Athenian cleruchy in the territory of Histiaea, which the Athenians had depopulated in 446, and where Hierocles possessed a plot of land.[37]

A further consideration strengthens the parallel: Herodotus provides for Themistocles' butchery what seems to be a religious sanction by way of the oracle of Bacis.[38] For according to Herodotus the Euboeans had failed to evacuate their stock when the Persians drew nigh, as the oracle had recommended. This oracle presumably belonged to the *χρησμοὶ ὑπὲρ Εὐβοίας* which were used to justify the sacrifices of 446. Yet a close reading of the verses of Bacis shows that they do not in fact enjoin the evacuation of goats from Euboea. *ἀπέχειν* (in the second line of the oracle) does not mean 'remove', but 'hold off, keep away'. The oracle's 'much-bleating goats' in my view do not stand for the Euboeans' stock in general, but rather for the polyglot (hence 'bleating') Persian army[39] which threatened to eat up the land like an infestation of goats. The oracle's import would then be as follows: 'When the Persian King bridges the Hellespont, keep his troops away from Euboea!' It is then a justification, possibly invented *post eventum*, to defend the Greeks' choice of Cape

[37] Thuc. 1. 114. 3; Plut. *Per.* 23. 3. On Hierocles see Ar. *Pax* 1048. He was especially known as an interpreter of Bacis' oracles (cf. *Pax* 1070–2, 1119) and seems always to have insisted on an oracle as legitimation for a sacrifice (cf. *Pax* 1088–95).

[38] Hdt. 8. 20 *φράζεο, βαρβαρόφωνος ὅταν ζυγὸν εἰς ἅλα βάλλῃ*
βύβλινον, Εὐβοίης ἀπέχειν πολυμηκάδας αἶγας.

[39] Note the close semantic relationship between *βαρβαρόφωνος*, which here undoubtedly refers to the Great King, and *πολυμήκας*. On this cf. A. *Pers.* 65–76:

πεπέρακεν μὲν ὁ περσέπτολις ἤδη
βασίλειος στρατὸς εἰς ἀντίπορον γείτονα χώραν
λινοδέσμῳ σχεδίᾳ πορθμὸν ἀμείψας
Ἀθαμαντίδος Ἕλλας,
πολύγομφον ὅδισμα
ζυγὸν ἀμφιβαλὼν αὐχένι πόντου.
πολυάνδρου δ' Ἀσίας θούριος ἄρχων
ἐπὶ πᾶσαν χθόνα ποιμανόριον θεῖον ἐλαύνει
διχόθεν . . .

Artemisium as their first line of defence by sea.[40] A justification of this choice of position was with hindsight all the more necessary, for the Greeks had failed to halt the Persians' advance at the cape.[41]

It is difficult to explain why Herodotus misunderstood Bacis' oracle; simple ignorance of the oracle's intention may be to blame. Nevertheless, I do not view the idea as too far-fetched that Herodotus is here mimicking and by means of an obviously false interpretation criticizing the work of *χρησμολογοί* such as Hierocles or Lampon, work which lay under a pall of doubt even in Herodotus' own day.[42] For by means of their unscrupulous inventions and flagrant misinterpretations these soothsayers palliated the repressive measures of the Athenians. Already in the debate concerning the 'wooden wall' Herodotus (7. 142. 3; 143. 3) had presented the Athenian oracle interpreters as base poltroons.

However that may be, I trust it has by now become clear just how closely Herodotus has interwoven his criticism of the Athenians at the time of the league with his anecdotes about Themistocles at Cape Artemisium, anecdotes for which he had to undertake considerable alterations to his source material, precious little of which was historically useful anyway.

We find the same method at work in the account of Themistocles' blackmailing of the islanders (Hdt. 8. 111–12). In this anecdote the Greeks, just after Salamis, laid siege to the Cycladic island Andros, the inhabitants of which refused to pay the ransom demanded by Themistocles. During the negotiations Themistocles threatens the Andrians with the dread goddesses *Πειθώ* and *Ἀναγκαίη* who ever stand beside the Athenians—note that it is the Athenians and not

[40] For this reason the Euboeans could not have known of the oracle in 480. Significantly, this oracle of Bacis is to the best of my knowledge the only prophecy in the whole of the *Histories* which Herodotus quotes *after* he describes the event therein prophesied.

[41] With the oracle which praises Salamis as *θείη* the Athenians retrospectively provided themselves with a religious justification for their choice of battlefield, as I hope to be able to demonstrate on another occasion through an analysis of Hdt. 7. 139–44; cf. Hignett, *Xerxes' Invasion of Greece* [n. 17], 442–3.

[42] Cf. Ar. *Eq.* 1084–5; *Vesp.* 380; Cratinus fr. 62 Kassel–Austin. On this see N. D. Smith, 'Diviners and Divination in Aristophanic Comedy', *ClAnt* 8 (1989), 140–58; D. Lateiner, 'The Perception of Deception and Gullibility in Specialists of the Supernatural (Primarily) in the Athenian Literature', in R. M. Rosen and J. Farnell (eds.), *Nomodeiktes: Greek Studies in Honor of Martin Ostwald* (Ann Arbor, 1993), 179–95; D. Asheri, 'Erodoto e Bacide: Considerazioni sulla fede di Erodoto negli oracoli (Hdt. VIII 77)', in M. Sordi (ed.), *La profezia nel mondo antico* (CISA 19; Milan, 1993), 63–76 at 63–4.

the Greeks whom Persuasion and Compulsion help—and who are so ruthless that the Andrians will have to pay up no matter what.[43] *Πειθώ* and *Ἀναγκαίη* serve not only to give a name to the Herodotean Themistocles' pre-eminent qualities,[44] but also and especially to point to demagogy and sheer violence as the decisive instruments of Athenian rule. The religious arrogance which is bound up with the deification of these two principles of power attains its zenith in Herodotus' observation that the Parians' payment to Themistocles had 'propitiated' him.[45]

According to Herodotus, the dominating factor behind Themistocles' attacks on the islanders is *πλεονεξία*,[46] the desire to get more, i.e. that same quality which Thucydides (1. 77. 3–4) views as characteristic of the Athenians. When Herodotus lets the Andrians call Athens 'mighty' and 'rich',[47] he is consciously committing an egregious anachronism, as no one could possibly have characterized Athens in the autumn of 480 as 'rich'; after all, the Persians had burnt it to the ground just a few weeks earlier. Through this anachronism Herodotus wishes to make it clear that his criticism is really directed at the wealthy and imperialistic Athens of Pericles.

The conflict between Andrians and Athenians, like the famous Melian Dialogue in Thucydides, is meant to give an example of the Athenians' protection racket in operation.[48] Finally, the Andrians' complaint of their land's poverty (*γεωπείνης*, 8. 111. 3), which precludes their paying any ransom at all, actually has a concrete historical basis, as Cresci Marrone has demonstrated.[49] In 450/49 the Andrians complained about their *φόρος* of twelve talents, which

[43] Hdt. 8. 111. 2 *προϊσχομένου Θεμιστοκλέος λόγον τόνδε, ὡς ἥκοιεν Ἀθηναῖοι περὶ ἑωυτοὺς ἔχοντες δύο θεοὺς μεγάλους, Πειθώ τε καὶ Ἀναγκαίην, οὕτω τέ σφι κάρτα δοτέα εἶναι χρήματα . . ..*

[44] Cf. A. Bencsik, *Schelmentum und Macht: Studien zum Typus des σοφὸς ἀνήρ bei Herodot* (diss. Bonn, 1994), 118. Eupolis fr. 102 Kassel–Austin says of Pericles that *πειθώ τις*—perhaps conceived of as a goddess (cf. Cic. *Brut*. 59; Quint. *Inst*. 10. 1. 82)—sat on his lips.

[45] Herodotus elsewhere, like Homer, uses the word *ἱλάσκομαι* (8. 112. 3) only with reference to gods.

[46] Hdt. 8. 112. 1 *Θεμιστοκλέης δέ, οὐ γὰρ ἐπαύετο πλεονεκτέων . . .*

[47] Hdt. 8. 111. 2 *ὡς κατὰ λόγον ἦσαν ἄρα αἱ Ἀθῆναι μεγάλαι τε καὶ εὐδαίμονες καὶ θεῶν χρηστῶν ἥκοιεν εὖ.*

[48] Thuc. 5. 84–114. Thus already Strasburger, 'Herodot und das perikleische Athen' [n. 2], 21.

[49] Cresci Marrone, 'Temistocle e la "vigilia" dell'impero' [n. 8], 118–19. Andros clearly did not suffer from utter impecuniousness if it could pay the substantial tribute of twelve talents.

seemed excessive after the settlement of 250 Athenian cleruchs on their land; whereupon their tribute was halved.[50] Herodotus could have constructed such an anecdote from those complaints in order to indicate allusively the two most important methods of exploiting the allies: first by violently extracting tributes and second by settling cleruchs on their land.

Although we have demonstrated some points of contact between this narrative of Herodotus' and the actions of the Athenians at the time of the Delian League, we have left open the question whether it contains any nuggets of historical truth. Did Themistocles actually attempt secretly to extort money from Andros, Carystus, and Paros? Many have compared the alleged activities of Themistocles with Miltiades' raid on Paros shortly after the battle of Marathon. Herodotus (6. 132–6) states that Miltiades, with a promise to obtain much gold for the Athenians, induced them to give him seventy ships for an expedition against a target known only to him. Then he unsuccessfully demanded a hundred talents from the Parians, allegedly as a fine for their Medism at Marathon. This story (as well as the one about Themistocles) has often been rationalized by positing that the Athenians or, as the case may be, the Greeks took advantage of their decisive victories at Marathon and Salamis to extort tribute or reparations from those Greeks on the Persian side.[51] But this can hardly have been the attackers' primary object, as becomes abundantly clear when we consider the strategic significance of the besieged places. Paros, even after Marathon, continued to serve as a Persian base in the western Aegean;[52] whereas the Andrians' and Carystians' unswerving loyalty to the Persians after Salamis represented, in fact, a direct threat to the Athenians, since these states controlled the entrance to the Saronic Gulf and to the Euripus Strait.[53] The expeditions attributed to Miltiades

[50] Cf. Plut. *Per.* 11. 5. Cf. W. Schuller, *Die Herrschaft der Athener im Ersten Attischen Seebund* (Berlin and New York, 1974), 22–3 and 174. Interestingly, between 451/0 and 450/49 Carystus, which Themistocles later besieged, was accommodated with a reduction of its tribute from seven and a half to five talents, since it too (like Andros) was compelled to receive Athenian cleruchs (cf. Diod. 11. 88. 3; Paus. 1. 27. 5).

[51] So Hignett, *Xerxes' Invasion of Greece* [n. 17], 243; Podlecki, *The Life of Themistocles* [n. 8], 70–1; Cresci Marrone, 'Temistocle e la "vigilia" dell'impero' [n. 8], 125.

[52] Cf. D. Berranger, *Recherches sur l'histoire et la prosopographie de Paros à l'époque archaïque* (Clermont-Ferrand, 1992), 316–18.

[53] Cf. Hdt. 8. 66. 2 and 5. 31. 2–3; J. Heinrichs, *Ionien nach Salamis: Die kleinasi-*

and Themistocles therefore had as their aim the conquest of these strategically important places.

Be that as it may, both ended in disaster. Although Herodotus makes an injury sustained by Miltiades the reason for breaking off the siege of Paros, Ephorus (*FGrHist* 70 F 63) and Cornelius Nepos (*Miltiades* 7), who used him, provide a more plausible explanation according to which Miltiades returned empty-handed to Athens for fear that a Persian relief force might be sent to Paros.[54] Back in Athens Miltiades was none the less tried on a charge of having accepted bribes from the Persians; instead of being sentenced to death, however, he received a fine of fifty talents—presumably for lifting the siege without permission. But it is quite plausible to suppose that the charge brought against him had originally been one of receiving bribes, since Herodotus (6. 136. 2) himself reports that Miltiades' defenders, in order to avert the death penalty, made much of his distinguished record of service to his native land: the victory at Marathon and the conquest of Lemnos. Such arguments would have been inappropriate with another charge.[55] Besides, the Athenians always were in the habit of accusing unsuccessful generals of taking bribes, even in Thucydides' and Demosthenes' times.[56]

We should suspect something similar in the case of Themistocles'

atischen Griechen in der Politik und politischen Reflexion des Mutterlandes (Bonn, 1989), 15.

[54] Thus also R. Macan, *Herodotus: The Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Books*, ii (London, 1895), 254–6. Nep. *Milt.* 7. 3–5: 'cum iam in eo esset ut oppido potiretur, procul in continenti lucus qui ex insula conspiciebatur nescio quo casu nocturno tempore incensus est. cuius flamma ut ab oppidanis et oppugnatoribus est visa, utrisque venit in opinionem signum a classiariis regiis datum. quo factum est ut et Parii a deditione deterrerentur et Miltiades, timens ne classis regia adventaret, incensis operibus quae statuerat, cum totidem navibus atque erat profectus Athenas magna cum offensione civium suorum rediret. accusatus ergo est proditionis, quod, cum Parum expugnare posset, a rege corruptus infectis rebus discessisset.' On the other hand, D. Hamel, *Athenian Generals: Military Authority in the Classical Period* (*Mnemosyne* suppl. 182; Leiden, 1998), 168–71 (app. 3), puts too much trust in Herodotus' report.

[55] Cf. K. Kinzl, 'Miltiades' Parosexpedition in der Geschichtsschreibung', *Hermes*, 104 (1976), 280–307 at 288.

[56] Accordingly, after his defeat at Syracuse Nicias fears the Athenians' litigiousness, should he return early, more than his victorious enemy (Thuc. 7. 48. 3–4). Cf. also Thuc. 3. 98. 5; 4. 65. 4; Plut. *Cim.* 14. 3; compare also Demosthenes' outburst (4. 47) over the fact that the Athenians put every general on trial for his life at least two or three times. Further material in W. K. Pritchett, *The Greek State at War*, ii (Berkeley, 1974), 4–33, 127–9; J. E. T. Roberts, *The Impeachment of Generals at Athens during the Classical Period: A Study in Political Accountability* (diss. Yale, 1976); Hamel, *Athenian Generals* [n. 54], 122–35.

expedition as well, since he failed to take either Andros or Carystus and succeeded only in laying waste the territory of Carystus. Herodotus endeavours to palliate this failure by mentioning it in a completely different context.[57] If, however, we combine Themistocles' failure with Herodotus' account of the islanders' payments to him, then we may conclude that Herodotus' original source had reported that the Andrians and Carystians had bribed Themistocles to lift the sieges. Such an accusation—whether formally lodged in a trial or more probably only bruited about by rumour—could (besides a general dissatisfaction with his military leadership) explain why Themistocles received no commands from the Athenians after 479. Perhaps we may catch a lingering echo of such a trial or at least of such accusations in Timocreon's insulting him as a traitor (*προδόταν*) or in later charges of collaboration with the (alleged) Medizer Pausanias, which neither Thucydides nor anyone else could substantiate.[58]

If we posit some such accusation in Herodotus' source, then Herodotus will have again stood the story on its head: Themistocles was not bribed, but actively extorted money from the islanders. By attributing to the Andrians a firm refusal to pay, Herodotus flatly denies this hypothetical slander that they bribed Themistocles. The ransom which the Carystians allegedly paid serves Herodotus' purpose of equating their treatment with that of the other Euboeans at Cape Artemisium: even though they paid Themistocles large sums of money so that he would protect or at least not harm them, nevertheless they suffered terribly at his hands. Finally the fictional

[57] Hdt. 8. 121. 1 (after describing Xerxes' flight): *οἱ δὲ Ἕλληνες ἐπείτε οὐκ οἷοί τε ἐγίνοντο ἐξελεῖν τὴν Ἄνδρον, τραπόμενοι ἐς Κάρυστον καὶ δηιώσαντες αὐτῶν τὴν χώρην ἀπαλλάσσοντο ἐς Σαλαμῖνα.*

[58] Following R. J. Lenardon, 'The Chronology of Themistokles' Ostracism and Exile', *Historia*, 8 (1959) 23–48; O. de Bruyn, *La Compétence de l'Aréopage en matière de procès publics* (*Historia* Einzelschriften, 90; Stuttgart, 1995), 55–9, dates the first of at least two prosecutions of Themistocles (cf. D.S. 11. 54; Plut. *Them.* 23. 4) in *c.*476/5. The Alcmaeonid Leobotes is reported to have accused Themistocles of treason (cf. Craterus of Macedonia *FGrHist* 342 F 11a; Plut. *Them.* 23. 1) commited perhaps during his generalship in 480 (cf. ps.-Themistocles *Ep.* 11, p. 751 Hercher *προδοσίαν τῆς ἐμῆς στρατηγίας*, although the source for this is highly suspect). Whether he was charged before the Areopagus or before the assembly is of minor interest to us (cf. P. J. Rhodes, *The Athenian Boule* (Oxford, 1972), 199–201, and *A Commentary on the Aristotelian* Athenaion Politeia, rev. edn. (Oxford, 1993), 316 ff., 319 ff.). The following might also provide an explanation for his loss of power: in view of Diodorus' report (11. 27. 3) that the Athenian people deposed Themistocles because he had accepted gifts from the Lacedaemonians, Hamel, *Athenian Generals* [n. 54], 14, supposes a technical deposition.

payments of the Parians to Themistocles serve to provide a contrast with Miltiades' catastrophe there.[59]

Through a complete rearrangement of the story's elements Herodotus transforms Themistocles from a corruptible traitor into a self-aggrandizing extortionist. The point of this anecdote, as in the case of Miltiades, is to lay bare the Athenians' unscrupulous practice in bringing in the *φόρος*[60] while avoiding a direct charge of treason against those who defeated the Persians.

Besides his main purpose, namely to criticise contemporary Athenians for enslaving other Greeks, the low historical value of Herodotus' sources probably played an important role in his rewriting of the stories concerning Themistocles.[61] In the light of the foregoing we may suspect that for the most part Herodotus' sources consisted of slanderous tales against Themistocles. Since Herodotus must have realized that he could derive no authentic account of the actual events from such rumours, he may have felt justified in reconstructing the course of events according to his own judgement. In his stories about Themistocles, consequently, we find no citation of sources and no competing versions. And yet the stories current in Herodotus' day must have contained the most varied opinions on Themistocles. One thinks of the harshly negative comments of Timocreon and Stesimbrotus of Thasos or of the rather more positive remarks of Charon of Lampsacus, which I suspect are the source for Thucydides' digression on Themistocles.[62] Nevertheless, Herodotus' version has determined the view of Themistocles' character down to the present. Even the cen-

[59] The Parians had no need to fear the charge of Medism with which Themistocles seemed to justify the siege (Hdt. 8. 112. 2), since although the Persians directly threatened them, they had remained neutral (8. 67. 1). Herodotus' remark that he could not assert that other islands had paid money to Themistocles, but that he rather suspected it (8. 112. 2), could be an implicit disclaimer.

[60] Thus already Strasburger, 'Herodot und das perikleische Athen' [n. 2], 21; Raaflaub, 'Herodotus, Political Thought, and the Meaning of History' [n. 5], 239–40. It was precisely the Athenian generals who collected the tribute from the allies (cf. *IG* i³. 68. 40–2 and Schuller, *Die Heerschaft der Athener* [n. 50], 38–9).

[61] R. Thomas, *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens* (Cambridge, 1989), 95–144, and K. A. Raaflaub, 'Athenische Geschichte und mündliche Überlieferung', in J. von Ungern-Sternberg and H. Reinau (eds.), *Vergangenheit in mündlicher Überlieferung* (Colloquium Rauricum, 1; Stuttgart, 1988), 197–225 at 215–16, demonstrate on the basis of persuasive examples just how little historically useful information oral traditions contain three generations after the events themselves.

[62] I hope to show this elsewhere.

sorious Thucydides, notwithstanding minor corrections, accepts Herodotus' depiction.[63]

Herodotus leaves no room for doubt as to whom he awards the palm for repulsing Xerxes' invasion. For him the Athenians are the saviours of Greece, who, 'second only to the gods', had beaten off the invaders (7. 139. 5). And it is Themistocles whom he presents as the incarnation of the Athenians' courage and self-sacrifice; it is Themistocles who persuades his fellow citizens to evacuate Attica and to devote themselves fully to defending Greece by sea. Herodotus has him 'appear', in a theophany as it were, as the deus ex machina, when everyone else was at an utter loss, and makes him rescue all by correctly interpreting the oracle of the wooden wall.[64] In the lead-up to Salamis Themistocles alone—even though Mnesiphilus and Aristides, as representatives of all the Athenians, help to legitimize his actions[65]—forces the Peloponnesians, who desire to flee, to fight, by means of the first deceptive secret message to Xerxes (8. 75). Both before the battles at Cape Artemisium and before that of Salamis Themistocles holds Greek resistance together. If Herodotus had allowed even the faintest suspicion of treason to fall upon Themistocles, this symbol of the Athenians' will to fight, with one stroke of the pen he would have negated the glory of all Athenians as the defenders of Greek liberty. For this reason he removed every hint of Themistocles' corruptibility from his text.[66]

Nevertheless, Herodotus' Themistocles functions as freedom's champion only until the victory at Salamis. For after the immediate danger there has passed, he suddenly breaks the bonds which connect him to his home town of Athens and to Greece. His enthusiasm for his native land is metamorphosed into a narrow-minded

[63] Cf. Podlecki, *The Life of Themistocles* [n. 8], 47–65; E. M. Carawan, 'Thucydides and Stesimbrotus on the Exile of Themistocles', *Historia*, 38 (1989), 144–61; J. A. S. Evans, *Herodotus, Explorer of the Past: Three Essays* (Princeton, 1991), 41; A. Tsakmakis, *Thukydides über die Vergangenheit* (Tübingen, 1995), *passim*.

[64] Hdt. 7. 143–144. Cf. J. Hart, *Herodotus and Greek History* (London, 1982), 142. As I hope to have shown in ch. 1 of my dissertation, Herodotus, by inserting the enigmatic verse about Salamis, has overlaid that version, which credits the 'ship party' with saving the day (7. 142. 2 down to *ἀπέντας*), with a second version which glorifies Themistocles only and disparages the professional interpreters of oracles (ibid., from *τοὺς ὧν δή*).

[65] Mnesiphilus incites him to his deception (8. 57), whereas Aristides announces its success (8. 79–81). Thus the two scenes frame Themistocles' actions before Salamis.

[66] *Mutatis mutandis*, this is likewise true of the charge of treason against Miltiades, the victor at Marathon.

striving for personal gain. In the accounts of the islanders' blackmailing and of the second secret message to Xerxes Herodotus censures Themistocles for his self-centredness.[67] His egoism and his hubris after Salamis are obviously contrasted with his patriotism and uncompromising struggle for Greece up to that point. This bipartite division must be Herodotus' own construction.[68] The message concealed therein is revealed to his listeners only when they view Themistocles as a symbol for Athens as a whole. Herodotus has obviously implied an analogy: as is Themistocles to the Athenians, so are the Athenians to the Greeks.[69] During the Persian wars the Athenians—like Themistocles until Salamis—led the Greek defence against the Persians; but after the war, in the time of the league, the Athenians degenerated—like Themistocles after Salamis—into lawless oppressors of other Greeks and fell victim to exactly those vices which Herodotus attributes to Themistocles: *πλεονεξία* and hubris.

Herodotus points to this blunt reversal of the Athenians' be-

[67] In this second message Themistocles falsely ascribes to himself measures for securing the King's safety and thus acquires for himself, unbeknownst to the Athenians, a credit to redeem when he will flee to Persia (8. 109–110). Cf. also J. Marr, 'Themistocles and the Supposed Second Message to Xerxes: The Anatomy of a Legend', *Antiquité classique*, 38 (1995), 57–69.

[68] So C. W. Fornara, *Herodotus: An Interpretative Essay* (Oxford, 1971), 72: 'His purpose is artistic. He was attempting neither to blacken Themistocles' reputation nor to whitewash it. He was recreating Themistocles' character for the sake of his story, not for the "historical report".' Similarly Hart , *Herodotus and Greek History* [n. 64], 140–52, and especially Evans, *Herodotus, Explorer of the Past* [n. 63], 41: 'his [sc. Herodotus'] characters must be taken as his own artistic creations. He may have spoken with informants who knew Themistocles, Pausanias, or Miltiades personally, or conceivably Mardonius and Xerxes; but what he learned from these sources would be treated as raw material that was shaped to fit the general pattern of history. His artistic freedom, when it came to sketching character, was not a great deal less than that of Aeschylus'

[69] Rather suspected than proved by R. V. Munson, 'Artemisia in Herodotus', *ClAnt* 7 (1988), 91–106 at 100: 'Themistocles' attitude toward his own city is closely comparable to that of the polis Athens—that is, "the Athenians" as a deliberating citizen body—toward the rest of the Hellenes. Athens saved Greece (7. 139. 5), just as Themistocles was instrumental to the survival of Athens. But just as Themistocles is only conditionally loyal to Athens, so the city's Panhellenism, for all that it has an idealistic component, is also variable in the measure to which it serves Athenian interests.' Cf. Evans, *Herodotus, Explorer of the Past* [n. 63], 79–80: 'If Themistocles was guileful, that was also a characteristic of Athens, for she concealed her ambition for the hegemony of Greece until after the immediate danger from Persia was past, and then pursued it with single minded determination. Themistocles, more than any other Athenian, typified to Herodotus the restless, energetic spirit of Athens that led her to develop an empire.'

haviour at an even earlier time, when the Greeks contested the command of the fleet before the battle off Cape Artemisium. He says (8. 3. 2) that as long as the Athenians needed the help of the other Greeks, they submitted to the Peloponnesians; but after the Persian wars they snatched the command away from the Spartans on a pretext.

To sum up: in Themistocles Herodotus holds up a mirror to the Athenians. At first glance they receive much praise for their sacrifices during the Persian wars. On to his Themistocles Herodotus has even projected the envy which by their accomplishments the Athenians aroused among all the other Greeks.[70] If, however, the Athenians had peered more closely into the mirror and realized that Herodotus' stories of Themistocles were meant as a commentary on their own exploitative rule over the Delian League, they would have seen leering back at them the grotesque image of their own greed and violence. The admonition that all that is too high and too mighty must fall runs through the entire *Histories* as their most important leitmotiv. For this reason I consider it most probable that Herodotus, by projecting on to Themistocles a value judgement regarding the Athenians' history from the Persian wars down to the Archidamian war, truly wished to warn them of the dangers of unjust *ἀρχή* over other Greeks.

[70] Hdt. 8. 123–5; 7. 139. 1 (*ἐπίφθονον*). Cf. H. Wood, *The* Histories *of Herodotus* (The Hague, 1972), 186.

10

Herodotus' *Histories* and the Floating Gap

ROSALIND THOMAS

ANTHROPOLOGICAL work on oral tradition provides eloquent testimony to the existence of what is called the 'floating gap' and to the 'hourglass effect' which is closely associated with it. In societies where knowledge of the past is dependent upon memory and oral tradition, there tends to be a clustering of traditions and memories around the very distant past and the very recent.[1] This seems to be the case in whatever way the oral traditions are preserved, and whether or not those societies have some knowledge of writing. Many traditions may exist, for instance, about the first origins, and about the most recent two or three generations. The very recent past may be remembered simply because it was recent, within living memory: there are numerous examples where knowledge of the past peters out after three or four generations, unless there is some particular incentive to go back further. Yet at the same time the same society's traditions may have much to say about very remote times, times of origin, which have an important explanatory role—and there is a 'gap' in between. This gives a curious effect to the external observer, though to the people concerned it may be unremarked: a clustering of traditions at distant ends of a supposed chronological line with little information of any kind in between. Hence a couple of bulges at top and bottom with a tiny waist in the form of an hourglass. The periods in between become forgotten if they are not thought important in some way, they tend to fall out of the traditions, and the effect is to telescope the early and re-

[1] See J. Vansina, *Oral Tradition as History* (London, 1985); and in most depth, D. P. Henige, *The Chronology of Oral Tradition: Quest for a Chimera* (Oxford, 1974), and *Oral Historiography* (London, 1982).

cent periods together. The intervening period 'contracts', or rather, since it is not perceived as missing, the early and recent past grow closer.[2] The gap moves because as time progresses, the recent past that is remembered obviously moves forward in time too. Therefore the gap between recent and remote past can be said to 'float'.

This phenomenon is abundantly visible in ancient Greece. For instance, the early genealogists and mythographers concentrate overwhelmingly upon the times of heroes, and they were following the poetic traditions, Homeric and non-Homeric, which also preferred legends of gods and heroes to more recent times. A Pindaric celebration of a contemporary hero moves effortlessly between the victor and his recent family relations and a mythical origin, or heroic ancestor. Greek aristocrats tend to cite their Homeric ancestors and the descent line back from those ancestors to a god: Andocides' family traced their lineage back to Odysseus and Hermes (Hellanicus *FGrHist* 323a F 24), Alcibiades claimed descent from Eurysaces and therefore from Zeus (Plato *Alcib. I* 121 A), the Philaids from Ajax (Pherecydes *FGrHist* 3 F 2). Origins are remembered (or fabricated) for they are simply too important to neglect, the intervening links are less absorbing.

It is important to point out that this phenomenon does not suddenly cease when literacy arrives or even when historiography begins. Though the development of historiography and the study of chronology may have affected recognition of the phenomenon, what matters is what people bother to write down. If a historian records (even with embellishments) the traditions that are available, those traditions are still at the mercy of whatever processes of oblivion have occurred. The difference is that the historian or chronographer who has a linear chronological framework may be in a better position to work out that there *is* a gap, or how big that gap might be. If, for instance, the historian has alternative chronologies (e.g.

[2] Thus present-day inhabitants of the Turkish village near the site of Carian Alinda told me (in 1985) that the site is very ancient, as much as 300 years old. For discussion of how far back (in the recent past) Greek oral tradition goes see Oswyn Murray, 'Herodotus and Oral History', in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg and A. Kuhrt (eds.), *Achaemenid History*, ii. *The Greek Sources* (Leiden, 1987), 93–115 at 95–6, reprinted in the present volume (pp. 16–44 at 19–20), though he does not consider the remoter 'times of origins' in this calculation; also R. Thomas, *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens* (Cambridge, 1989). Note H. Strasburger, 'Herodots Zeitrechnung', *Historia*, 5 (1956), 129–61, repr. (with modifications) in W. Marg (ed.), *Herodot: Eine Auswahl aus der neueren Forschung*, 3rd edn. (Munich, 1982), 677–725, for Herodotus' construction of chronology.

in colonial written record), or perhaps compares contradictory genealogies, these may begin to indicate a larger time-frame (though we shall return to the difficult question of how, if at all, a historian can perceive such a gap). The temptation is then to fill it, once perceived. I have suggested that the few complete genealogies that we have from the Greek world—'complete' in the sense that they run down to the present without visible gaps—are in part the product of genealogists rather than pure oral traditions.[3] For as we can see repeatedly, family traditions tend to stress the remote heroic ancestors and divine links because these are the source of pride, rather than the intervening ancestors; the Athenian democracy, on the other hand, creates an alternative focus for family tradition which did not require heroic, remote glory but rather service to the polis in the present. In other cases, a chronology might be lengthened by such chronographers or genealogists not because they saw there was a gap which needed filling, but because, for instance, they assumed that successive office-holders were in father–son succession—a phenomenon well documented by Henige's *Chronology of Oral Tradition*. The point remains that if successive generations drop out of memory, it would be virtually impossible to regain that chronological space without some sort of chronological luck, machination, or guesswork. It is of course inconceivable that even Hecataeus' genealogy, reaching back to a god in sixteen generations, human time joining divine time, has not 'left out' generations.

The rest of this paper will concentrate on three questions: whether we can see traces of this floating gap in the *Histories*; whether Herodotus notices or tries to bridge this gap; and third, to what extent this picture of the shape of oral tradition is sufficient to describe the nature of the traditions about the past that Herodotus—or any Greek in the fifth century—would have encountered.

Can we, then, see this phenomenon within Herodotus' *Histories*? Was he aware of it? Did he simply replicate this general pattern of closing and disappearing gaps in his recording of traditions? Or, since he did not simply write down what he heard, can we perceive any other manifestations of this phenomenon in his vision of Greek history? It should be noted immediately that we shall have to talk both about the traditions behind Herodotus' account and about how he himself has presented them, and these are not always easy to distinguish in practice.

[3] Thomas, *Oral Tradition and Written Records* [n. 2], ch. 3.

At first there seem to be abundant signs that a similar pattern of traditions did indeed feed into his *Histories*. There are certainly a very large number of origin stories in the *Histories*, and they often occur without any exact chronological link being made, apart from the idea that one was earlier, one later, between the origin and the next point or period for which he has information.

Thus the history of Corinth, as narrated by Herodotus, 'begins' with the tale of Cypselus (5. 92): indeed that tale, the story of Cypselus' birth, his escape from the Bacchiads, and his return to Corinth, is effectively an origin tale for the tyranny of Corinth. We hear about the origins of the Ionians and of the other Asian Greek communities (1. 142 ff.), and about the Ionian founding of twelve cities in Ionia (145–7), but there is then a 'gap' in the narrative account, in strict chronological terms, until we reach the period in which they become subject first to the kings of Lydia, then the Persians (1. 14–22 and 27 for Gyges and later kings; 141–76 for the Persian conquest).

Or we may take, for instance, Herodotus' account of how the Spartans came to arrive in Lacedaemon, both the Spartan version and that of other Greeks (6. 52–3), and its relation to the later origin of Sparta's good government (εὐνομία). Herodotus' account does have the links in the chronological chain for the Dorian invasion itself, by means of the early and later reaches of the Spartan king-list.[4] But the coming of εὐνομία hangs in some sort of chronological no man's land somewhere between the Dorian invasion and the war with Tegea. At 1. 65 we are told about the recent victory against Tegea, and of the constant defeats in the joint reign of Leon and Agasicles: 'at a still earlier period', he continues, they were the worst-governed people in Greece, a situation saved by Lycurgus' reforms (65–6). Herodotus then recounts the tale of Lycurgus' visit to Delphi, from which he brings back the laws, and good order can begin. Accordingly, in the reigns of Anaxandrides and Ariston fortune turns in their favour against Tegea (1. 67). Thus it may seem that εὐνομία itself originates in some kind of floating gap, connected essentially with Lycurgus. It should be admitted that it is only when Herodotus mentions the Spartan version—that Lycurgus got the

[4] Note that the story is introduced as part of the question of which Spartan king conducted them into Lacedaemonia, and the Spartan version conflicts with that of the poets. For the Spartan king-lists see C. Calame, 'Le récit généalogique Spartiate: la représentation mythologique d'une organisation spatiale', *QS* 26 (1987), 43–91; also P. Cartledge, *Sparta and Lakonia* (London, 1979), appendix 3.

laws from Crete (65. 4)—that Lycurgus is described as regent, to his nephew Labotas, king of Sparta. So the 'Spartan version' does effectively provide some form of chronological tether to link Lycurgus to the Spartan king-line. But we may wonder how strong even the tradition about Lycurgus being regent to Labotas was, and whether this was not an attempt to give royal legitimacy to the far vaguer Greek tale of a Delphic visit. The origins of *εὐνομία* are enough if they are immensely remote.

The earliest 'respectable' Athenian history in the *Histories* emerges with Cylon (5. 71). Yet that may be another origin story, and it is certainly introduced in Herodotus as such, for in his conspiracy is found the origin of the Alcmaeonid curse, and that was certainly remembered in its own right (5. 71. 1: 'The way in which "the accursed" got their name is the following'). Otherwise we are told about the very earliest Athenian past, that past which was mixed up or even identified with the Pelasgians. We hear about the Pelasgians remarkably often, in fact, almost always in some story of origin, and the tales are often mutually contradictory, a fact which may not be unconnected.[5] Yet they are the remotest and vaguest of people, the earliest stratum of pre-Greek population in Greece. Typically of traditions of origin, they seem to exist on a separate chronological scale from the rest of Greek legends and history, separate even from the Trojan war. We may remember, as Oswyn Murray points out, that Herodotus does not seem to know of the period which modern historians and archaeologists see as the great period of colonization in the eighth and seventh centuries.[6]

Even the Egyptians in Herodotus' account are given a history which concentrates upon the very remote past and then recent history from just before the time that Greeks have been in Egypt (2. 99–100—I stress that this is in Herodotus' own presentation). His Egyptian history starts with the earliest king of Egypt, Min, and a curious scattering of others, but manages to dismiss the 330 successors to Min: 'The other kings, they said, were persons of no note

[5] 1. 56–8 (Athenians originally a Pelasgian people); 1. 146 (Arcadian Pelasgians); 2. 50–2 (gods from Pelasgians); 4. 145; 5. 26; 6. 136–40 (Lemnos, expulsion of Pelasgians from Attica); 7. 94–5 (ancient ancestors of Ionians and Aeolians); 8. 44 (Athenian names). For a clear discussion of the Pelasgians in Greek tradition see W. W. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus*, i. (Oxford, 1928), app. 15; cf. R. Thomas, 'Ethnography, Proof and Argument in Herodotus' Histories', *PCPhS* 43 (1997), 127–48 at 146–7.

[6] Murray, 'Herodotus and Oral History' [n. 2], 95–6 = above, pp. 19–20.

or distinction and left no monuments of any account, except for the last, who was named Moeris' (101. 1), and he goes on almost with relief to the successors of Moeris (102) until he reaches Psammetichus and the last few generations, during which the narrative has a markedly different character (151 ff.). Thus, curiously, even for this well-remembered and well-documented history, the traditions Herodotus had access to, whatever they were, laid emphasis upon the very early and the recent. The startlingly different Scythians are given an origin tale, in which Targitaus is the first Scythian and their first king (4. 5); a little later we are told that according to the Scythians there was a period of 1,000 years, 'neither less nor more', between their origin and the invasion by Darius (4. 7). Yet no history is given for the period in between, and we can probably assume there was none available.

But how far and how often does Herodotus actually try and bridge the gap or even notice it? In one sense there may be no floating gap in the *Histories* if Herodotus himself did not try to bridge it. One of the difficulties in talking about the floating gap in Herodotus is that it is very seldom visible. If, as anthropologists insist, the gap is only perceptible to the outside observer with a firm linear chronology and external points of reference, it is worth wondering how far Herodotus, or his informants and traditional sources, even noticed one.

For in many ways his method of 'digressions', in which he explains one action as a response to another, avoids any problem of revealing a chronological gap because he may make links through a trail of vengeance or retaliation. His digressions often take the form of explanations in the form of origin stories, and a trail of vengeance offers fixed points in the process of revenge, but little in the way of an exact chronological relationship is even necessary. In such a scheme of historical explanation, exact chronology would be irrelevant to the communities remembering such traditions, and it often seems irrelevant to Herodotus' *Histories* also. It is the trail of revenge which is the crucial core of the tradition, not the relative dating, the mere chronological relationship. We may wonder here if Herodotus is simply replicating a pattern similar to that of the fragmented and partial traditions he came across.

Aegina's quarrel with Athens, for instance, is notoriously difficult to place chronologically, yet it has in Herodotus' account a crucial explanatory role for Athens' development before the Persian

invasion (5. 81–9; 82. 1: 'The ancient quarrel between the Aeginetans and Athenians arose from the following origin'). The hostile, friendly, and retaliatory relations between Samos, Sparta, Corinth, and Corcyra involve a series of tit-for-tat actions which are not firmly placed in any chronological context, but rely for their placing on the individual monarchs involved or simply pure priority and the cycle of retaliation (3. 44–53). According to Herodotus' account (3. 47), the Spartans attack Polycrates, tyrant of Samos, at the request of certain Samian exiles: for the Spartans, 'if we may believe the Samians', are grateful to the Samians for once sending help against the Messenians (period unspecified), but the Spartans say they wished to punish the Samians for stealing an impressive bowl Sparta had sent to Croesus (described earlier, 1. 70), and a corselet Amasis was sending to Sparta; Corinth helped in the attack because the Corinthians too had been insulted 'a generation earlier' by the Samians, who captured the Corcyraean boys Periander was sending to Sardis (3. 48–9), which act was itself vengeance by Periander on the Corcyraeans for killing his son (3. 53). In this famous example of multiple reciprocal hostility, the tales do provide some 'data' for chronological synchronisms, but the main aim of each tale is surely not to provide synchronisms but rather explanations, excuses for a train of vengeance, in which relative priority is all that matters in the chronological sphere.

Cylon's coup and the origin of the Alcmaeonid curse stand as explanations, origin tales in their own right, their precise chronological relationship to any other Athenian activity notoriously vague (5. 71—see above). As for the origin of the Macedonian kings, in a story of origin rather than one to explain later hostility Herodotus gives us the story of how Perdiccas came to obtain the kingdom of Macedonia, another tale in which the unrecognized future king (and youngest bother) is revealed by miraculous signs and his unaccountable acceptance of the sun's light as wages (8. 137–9; also 5. 22. 1–2). Perdiccas is 'six generations back' from Alexander. While Herodotus gives us the names of the kings in between, who conveniently form a line of father–son succession (8. 139), his account focuses upon Perdiccas and the Alexander who participated in the Persian wars, rather than the intervening kings—and perhaps the traditional tales he heard did so too.

It seems probable, then, that Herodotus' digressive method of introducing a further tale as an explanation of origins, or hostility,

or friendship actually enabled him to avoid the strict chronological questions. Perhaps the traditions from which he worked remembered the past in the same way—events tied to each other through a train of vengeance or explanations of origin. At least this seems very probable. But then the very style of the 'digression', the train of explanation by which such tales are introduced, may make it unlikely in such cases that a floating gap would become apparent either to those transmitting the tales or to Herodotus himself.

So far, we can discern the hourglass pattern in some sections of the *Histories*; but it has also been suggested that Herodotus' method of 'digressions' may effectively obscure the gap in the traditions, or at least not make it blatantly obvious. Finally, let us turn back to the general model suggested by the anthropological evidence, and look at some problems it raises. The scheme suggested by anthropological investigations into oral tradition is surely far simpler than that suggested by the traditions that Herodotus would have had to deal with—and this is even before one asks the additional question of how far Herodotus himself might have manipulated or otherwise improved his tales.[7] I would like to suggest some possible reasons for this, and therefore some problems with taking on the model wholesale.

First, there is no single line of official tradition in the Greek and non-Greek world of the mid- to late fifth century. Herodotus deals with a multiplicity of traditions and groups who could transmit (or alter and manipulate) traditions. The anthropological examples tend, so far as one can see, to involve societies with a single 'line' of official traditions, the society's myths of origin, the royal traditions, the central traditions enshrined and preserved at the political centre of the tribe or people. In Herodotus we see a very complex web of traditions drawn from different poleis, each with their competing tales and their own sense of local history, as Fowler stresses, or from different non-Greek societies probably via a Greek intermediary, and of aristocratic family traditions, and the more general traditions of Delphi.[8] We only need compare the conflicting tale of

[7] Cf. in particular the paper by A. Griffiths in this volume.

[8] See Luraghi in this volume for further examination of the kinds of tradition Herodotus used. Fowler stresses a sense of local history in his paper above. See also the important article by Oswyn Murray, 'Herodotus and Oral History [n. 2], 105–6 = above, pp. 31–2, for Delphi; H. Erbse, *Studien zum Verständnis Herodots* (Berlin, 1992); J. A. S. Evans, *Herodotus, Explorer of the Past: Three Essays* (Princeton, 1991)—who lays too much emphasis, to my mind, on the presence of expert

the Spartans about the Dorian invasion and the origin of the dual kingship, and the version of 'the rest of the Greeks' (6. 52–3), a case where there seem to be conflicting traditions inside and outside Sparta. Similarly, there are impossible problems in fitting the Pelasgians into any other set of traditions about early Greek history, and indeed the tales in Herodotus alone conflict with each other, no doubt because they grew up to explain quite different phenomena and among quite different groups. This introduces a degree of complexity or potential complexity that is not really glimpsed in the anthropological examples. In Herodotus' world there must be multiplicity of floating gaps.

Second, and even more important, the sheer presence of the Homeric poems is crucial. The Homeric epic is always present in Greek ideas about their past, and the fact that it was well preserved meant that, for Greek traditions, one element was immovable and unforgettable, set in a literary tradition. Much of the focus of Greek tradition, 'memory' or oral tradition, is trying to connect family or polis to the Homeric heroes, the world of the Homeric poems. Aristocrats, for instance, parade Homeric ancestors, and in the tales of the Nostoi whole cities connect themselves to their 'origins' in the world of the Homeric epic. So we must suspect one 'floating gap' between the recent past and the period Homer described; or between the recent past and the period or experience which could be tied loosely to the Homeric tales as 'some time after', as we see with the tales of the Ionian migration.[9] That provides one set of 'gaps'. However, remote origins might be even earlier than the period of the Homeric age, if we compare, for instance, the tale of Athenians originating from their own land, at a time far earlier than the period of the Homeric heroes (cf. 1. 57, Athenians being Pelasgoi).

The presence of the Homeric epics gives Greek oral traditions about early times an alternative focus, or perhaps at least two focuses and an element of the past which could not be conveniently forgot-

remembrancers of tradition (*λόγιοι*) in Greece; John Gould, *Herodotus* (London, 1989), ch. 2. Chapter 5 of my *Oral Tradition and Written Record* [n. 2] deals with the various different sources and traditions that Herodotus must have used for his version of the expulsion of the Athenian tyrants, part of the argument being that he could not possibly have depended on an Alcmaeonid tradition alone.

[9] Note also the relevant observations of Murray, 'Herodotus and Oral History' [n. 2], 97 = above, p. 22, on the Homeric epic's concentration upon one generation, not seeking actively to locate its heroes 'in a larger historical framework'.

ten. Occasionally we may be able to see this at work in Herodotus' accounts. Perhaps Herodotus' attempt to fit Homeric legends and figures into the span of Egyptian history in book 2 might be an example of this pattern; or the remote Pelasgian past, already mentioned, which floats in a period so much earlier than the Homeric one. Similarly with the myths of women being seized at the start of the *Histories*. Herodotus implies that the gods once lived on earth (2. 143–5), and if believed, that should have given the Greek traditions an original focus other than the Homeric heroes. Perhaps the most promising example for our purposes is the treatment of Egyptian history itself, and Herodotus' attempt to 'fit' Greek history, and especially the Greek gods, into the Egyptian past. Here we return to the question of whether Herodotus was aware of the problem of the 'floating gap'.

Let us turn finally, then, to the 'problem' of Egypt and her fantastically long history. So far from following the *λόγιοι*, if they even existed in Greece,[10] Herodotus was aware of a quite different tradition in Egypt, with a totally different chronological depth and one which a Greek found it hard to contemplate. Even in Herodotus' account of the Egyptian kings there is a massive gap between the early and the late, as we have seen (2. 100–1). Between Min and Sesostris were 'no kings of any note', yet there were 330 names, according to Herodotus, in that category (2. 100. 1; 101. 1). Shortly after (ch. 112) we reach Proteus, contemporary of Helen of Troy. But the whole of Egyptian history was on a far deeper chronological scale than Greek, and anything most Greeks could easily imagine.

Whatever we think about the precise origins of Herodotus' idea that Egyptian human history had a depth of 345 generations (2. 143),[11] he states and reaffirms it (2. 145), with reckonings of thousands of years between the birth of Heracles, for instance, and the

[10] *Λόγιοι* suggested by Evans, *Herodotus* [n. 8]. For Herodotus as heir to the *λογοποιοί* of Ionia cf. Murray, 'Herodotus and Oral History' [n. 2], following W. Aly, *Volksmärchen, Sage und Novelle bei Herodot und seinen Zeitgenossen* (Göttingen, 1921; repr. with appendix 1969).

[11] For different theories see Alan Lloyd, *Herodotus, Book II: Introduction* (vol. i) and vol. iii ad loc. (Leiden, 1975); and D. Fehling, *Herodotus and his 'Sources': Citation, Invention and Narrative Art* (Leeds, 1989), 77–85. I am aware, of course, that the Egyptian *λόγος* in general has provoked accusations of deliberate, conscious fabrication and passionate defence. Both seem to me to underestimate the process and difficulties of making sense of a foreign civilization (cf. e.g., for the discovery of the New World, Stephen Greenblatt, *Marvelous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World* (Oxford, 1991)) and to be bound up with (or in reaction to) an ideal of the historian which must be anachronistic for this period.

reign of Amasis (17,000 years: 2. 43); the period from the time of Dionysus to the present he calculates to be 1,600 years (2. 145), and so on. The Egyptians cannot be wrong, he says, because they keep a reckoning of the years (2. 145). The case of the statues of the high priests (2. 143), which serve to back up this chronology, is a typical example of a type of chronological reckoning where office-holders are instantly converted into the chronological equivalent of generations. This is an exact example of the phenomenon of lengthening chronology by means of the fallacious assumption that each office-holder covers one generation, analysed so clearly by Henige, in *The Chronology of Oral Tradition*.

The conflict with Greek traditions and implied chronology is even more interesting. As Herodotus puts it (2. 143. 4), making Hecataeus look naïve, 'When Hecataeus, in giving his genealogy, mentioned a god as his sixteenth ancestor, the priests opposed their genealogy to his, going through this list, and refusing to allow that any man was born of a god.' They go through the 345 high priests, each a son of the preceding one, and not a single one is a god (143, 144. 1): this time-span, when calculated, thus comes to 11,340 years (142). But before that, they agree that yes, the gods ruled Egypt and dwelt on the earth with men.

This then leads on to Herodotus' comparison of what the Egyptians calculate about the time of the gods (hence Heracles is 17,000 years before Amasis), and the implications of Greek traditions about the age of the gods and when they were born (esp. chs. 145–6). If not a single god had ever appeared on earth in Egypt during the whole long period of their recorded history, something must be severely wrong with the Greeks' memory. Hecataeus' family reaches back, after all, to a god in sixteen generations, and there is every reason to suspect that for most Greek aristocratic families the distance between the present and the heroic (and thence divine) generation might be thought to be even less, if it ever occurred to them to calculate it. Herodotus' conclusion is of course that the Greeks reckon the birth of the gods (certain gods: ch. 146) from the time they came to know about them (literally, 'know their names'). The Egyptians knew of them long ago and had not set eyes on them on earth for 11,000 years; the Greeks entered into this knowledge relatively recently.

This suggests, first, that Herodotus is using Egypt and his Egyptian *λόγος* not only to periodize human history (as Pietro Vannicelli

suggests, surely rightly): he is also on some level using it to incorporate the gods—or more precisely, knowledge of the gods—into the grand sweep of his history and his historical chronology.

Moreover, we seem to be seeing Herodotus trying in effect to grapple with the chronology of oral tradition and the effect of the 'floating gap'. By nature oral tradition tends, as we saw, to be uninterested in middle-period history (family, genealogy, etc.), and thus generations, periods, 'fall out' of memory probably unconsciously, with the result that the floating gap becomes telescoped. The sixteen-generation calculation back to a divine ancestor of Hecataeus seems longer than most family traditions, but then it belonged to a geneaologist and mythographer who might be expected to add information rather than neglect it. Even so, it is inconceivable that even his 'calculation' has not telescoped the past. Greek history is therefore relatively shallow because of this.

The Egyptian tradition, on the other hand, may be the result of the opposite process—and here we set aside the doubts raised about the exact numbers of generations, for Herodotus has probably neatened the numbers so that they are consistent.[12] Lists of officeholders are converted into generations regardless of the possibility that some might hold office simultaneously, as was certainly true of the Egyptian kings in some periods, or succeed after only a short interval. This creates a massive artificial lengthening of the period of human history.

Herodotus' new theories which result from this massive lengthening may be an excessively enthusiastic conclusion from the lengthy Egyptian chronology (or perceived chronology), but nevertheless they seem to be closely related to the problem of the floating gap in *Greek* history. And they indicate clearly that Herodotus himself was aware, not of the floating gap itself, but that the results or manifestations of it needed explanation and could not be taken at face value. We should be reluctant to be patronizing about this: Herodotus may be attempting to explain or rationalize the results of the floating gap visible in the traditions of Greece and of lengthening chronology in Egyptian history. Hence he has the Greeks, with their shallow history, learning from the Egyptians, with their lengthy one, at a period which by Egyptian standards was rather late, and following his model of human society developing by 'learning' from others.

[12] See n. 11 above.

Conclusions

The pattern of traditions encapsulated by the expression 'floating gap' or 'hourglass effect' is abundantly visible in the *Histories*. Very often, however, Herodotus does not tackle the 'problem' of stories floating in a chronological vacuum, and his digressive mode of explanation, which relies upon links of vengeance, alliance, and the like, avoids doing so. If this were the way many such tales were actually remembered by the various Greek traditions, then neither would they have any 'need' to set out a linear chronology with any more care than is visible in Herodotus' accounts. But the phenomenon was very much more complex for the Greek historian than the anthropological model implies, since the groups telling and transmitting such traditions seem to have been various and unorganized, mostly uncentralized and almost always 'unofficial'. Moreover, the Homeric poems create an alternative period of 'origins' to which many families, cities, and probably other groups wished to connect their past. Finally, in the Egyptian *λόγος* we see Herodotus beginning to tackle the problem, not of the floating gap itself, but of the results of the floating gap. We can see him, and perhaps his Greek or Egyptian sources, grappling with the need somehow to incorporate the Homeric poems, and even more interesting, to rationalize and incorporate the Greek traditions of painfully short time-span into the artificially lengthened extent of the Egyptian past.

II

Herodotus' Egypt and the Foundations of Universal History

PIETRO VANNICELLI

I

In book 2, an extensive excursus dedicated to Egypt and described as exceptional by the author himself (2. 35. 1), Herodotus' effort to declare and define his own method of investigation is particularly evident: the exposition is marked by a series of methodological statements, more numerous than elsewhere in the *Histories*, concerning the origin and characteristics of the sources and evidence considered. At the same time, in the light of the incomparable antiquity, continuity, and authoritativeness of Egyptian historical documentation, Herodotus systematically criticizes Greek traditions on the remote past, and includes in his vigorous polemic relevant components of Greek archaic culture (from Homer and Hesiod to the Ionian thinkers), pointing out the indebtedness of the Greeks to the Egyptians, above all in the religious and cultural spheres.

Because of its distinct characteristics, book 2 has often been used to reconstruct the initial phases of the intellectual and historiographical path of Herodotus. Part of this effort has included an appraisal of the complexity and careful construction of this book as well as its role in the *Histories*.[1] Here I intend to contribute to this evaluation, highlighting the chronological side of the Herodotean

[1] For an overview of research on book 2 see Ch. W. Fornara, *Herodotus: An Interpretative Essay* (Oxford, 1971), 1–23. In the following footnotes references are kept to a minimum. The works quoted, particularly A. B. Lloyd's three-volume commentary on book 2 (Leiden, 1975–87), offer further references to the (huge) bibliography on book 2. I have used the translation by A. D. Godley in the Loeb series, with modifications.

exposition, i.e. Herodotus' undertaking in the course of the book, and particularly in chapters 2–146, (1) to define the beginning and the extent of human history as documented in Egypt, and (2) to subdivide the historical space so delimited into epochs of universal value.

Chronology is only *one* point of view—a thread within the complex weave of book 2, but an important thread, with which all the other essential themes of Herodotus' reflection are connected, and which contributes to clarifying the relationship between book 2 and the rest of the *Histories*.[2] Since in the brief span of this article it is not possible to illustrate all the aspects of Herodotus' concerns with chronology, I shall concentrate mainly on the opening chapters of book 2 (2–4) and the closely related chapters dedicated to pharaonic history (mainly the pre-Dodecarchy section: 99–146).

The initial chapters well illustrate the centrality of chronological concerns in book 2 and the convergence in it of many essential aspects of the Herodotean investigation. The theme of Egypt's antiquity—certainly already traditional in Herodotus' time—is in fact the first subject he deals with (2. 2–4): Herodotus takes for granted the primacy of the Egyptians as regards antiquity (see 15. 2–3: the origins of the Egyptians are essentially the same as the origins of the human race itself) and intends to define how much of

[2] One drawback of many contributions on Herodotus' chronological interests was precisely that they considered this aspect of Herodotus' thought in isolation. The starting-point of modern research on Herodotus' chronology is E. Meyer, 'Herodots Chronologie der griechischen Sagengeschichte', in his *Forschungen zur Alten Geschichte*, i (Halle, 1892), 153–88; among the most important later contributions, see K. von Fritz, 'Herodotus and the Growth of Greek Historiography', *TAPhA* 67 (1936), 315–40; D. W. Prakken, *Studies in Greek Genealogical Chronology* (Lancaster, Pa., 1943), 18–48; F. Mitchel, 'Herodotus' Use of Genealogical Chronology', *Phoenix*, 10 (1956), 48–69; H. Strasburger, 'Herodots Zeitrechnung', *Historia*, 5 (1956), 126–61, repr. with corrections and supplements in W. Marg (ed.), *Herodot: Eine Auswahl aus der neueren Forschung* (Munich, 1962), 677–725, and in H. Strasburger, *Studien zur Alten Geschichte*, ii (Hildesheim and New York, 1982), 627–75, who does not treat Herodotus' chronology of the mythical age (cf. the discussion in P. Vannicelli, *Erodoto e la storia dell'alto e medio arcaismo* (*Sparta–Tessaglia–Cirene*) (Rome, 1993, 9 ff.); R. Drews, 'The Fall of Astyages and Herodotus' Chronology', *Historia*, 18 (1969), 1–11; A. B. Lloyd, *Herodotus, Book II: Introduction* (Leiden, 1975), 171–94; A. A. Mosshammer, *The* Chronicle *of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition* (Lewisburg and London, 1979), 101–12; A. Giovannini, 'La guerre de Troie entre mythe et histoire', *Ktema*, 20 (1995), 139–76; W. Burkert, 'Lydia between East and West or How to Date the Trojan War: A Study in Herodotus', in J. B. Carter and S. P. Morris (eds.), *The Ages of Homer* (Austin, 1995), 139–48: C. Calame, 'Mémoire collective et temporalités en contact: Somare et Hérodote', *RHR* 215 (1998), 341–67.

this antiquity of Egyptian history may actually be documented. He is therefore searching for the earliest point from which to depart and begin a continuous and documented exposition of Egyptian history. This point will serve as a chronological threshold which is also the oldest attainable point of human history.

The structure of 2. 2–4 is almost the same as that of the opening chapters of book 1 (1–5).[3] In both places Herodotus poses the problem of where to begin. First, he refers to the opinion of the λόγιοι—Persian and Egyptian respectively—then, setting them aside with a form of *recusatio* probably characteristic of sophistic speech,[4] he intervenes in the first person to indicate his own choice. At the beginning of book 1 Herodotus renounces the mythical rapes of Greek and barbarian women and states the starting-point of his ἀπόδεξις—Croesus, 'whom I myself know to have done unprovoked wrong to the Greeks' (1. 5. 3). Similarly, at the beginning of book 2 he rejects the doubtful outcome of the linguistic experiment of Psammetichus (2. 2) and other related traditions concerning the most distant past (cf. 3. 1: 'I heard also other things at Memphis, in conversation with the priests of Hephaestus', connecting Psammetichus' experiment to what follows), refusing *ex professo* to deal with 'the stories about the gods' (3. 2; cf. 65. 2) and consequently restricting his field to that of human affairs, ἀνθρωπήια πρήγματα (4. 1); within this field the starting-point of Egyptian history is Min, the first man to reign over Egypt (4. 2).[5] In both cases Herodotus' choice is influenced by the possibility of verifying the traditions related to the chosen periods. In the case of Croesus (the upper chronological limit of his historical work) Herodotus speaks of what he knows, without reference to any other source; in the case of Min (the upper chronological limit of Egyptian, i.e. human, history) he bases himself on the words of the priests of Memphis, Thebes, and Heliopolis (4. 2), who, he states, in most cases concretely (ἔργῳ) proved their claims.

Two points particularly deserve attention: (1) the qualification of

[3] For a comparative analysis of 1. 1–5 and 2. 2–4 see my 'L'esperimento linguistico di Psammetico (Herodot. II 2): C'era una volta il frigio', in *Frigi e frigio* (Atti del I Simposio Internazionale, Roma, 16–17 ottobre 1995; Rome, 1997), 201–17 at 212 ff.

[4] H. Pelliccia, 'Sappho 16, Gorgias' *Helen*, and the Preface to Herodotus' *Histories*', *YCS* 29 (1992), 63–84; this rhetorical device is often used by Herodotus to emphasize the beginning of a new section of his work.

[5] For some remarks about the relationship between these two historical divides see below, sect. IV.

the Egyptian priests as λόγιοι and (2) the way in which Herodotus introduces Min's chronological role.

(1) While in books 1 and 4 (1. 1. 1 and 4. 46. 1 respectively) Herodotus simply mentions people whom he qualifies as λόγιοι, more details on the meaning of the term come, as usual, from book 2: the priests at Heliopolis are said to be Αἰγυπτίων λογιώτατοι (2. 3. 1: an assertion from which one may reasonably infer that the priests of Memphis and Thebes mentioned together with them are at least λόγιοι); and Heliopolis and Memphis are included when he says that 'the Egyptians who dwell in the cultivated part of Egypt are the men who more than any other exercise their memory, and therefore are by far the λογιώτατοι among those of whom I have made trial' (2. 77. 1).[6] We may summarize the above in three points: people qualified as λόγιοι in Egypt are priests (that is, those who belong to a special category); they owe their superiority to practising memory; they are the most learned.

The λόγιοι specifically mentioned by Herodotus are foreign (i.e. non-Greek).[7] Assessing who is λόγιος, and who is more λόγιος or less λόγιος, seems to become relevant for Herodotus when collecting historical traditions outside the world of the polis. To define the meaning of the expression, one could use Herodotus' description of the priests of the temple of Heracles at Tyre: he questions them regarding the chronology of Heracles, in an effort to acquire precise information from those who could provide it (2. 44. 1: ἐξ ὧν οἷον τε ἦν). One should stress the close connection between the excellence of an informer, i.e. his being particularly λόγιος, and his mastery of traditions *concerning the most distant past*: the Egyptians, the most ancient among all peoples (2. 15. 2), have the λογιώτατοι, while the Scythians, the youngest of all nations (4. 5. 1), count only one ἀνὴρ λόγιος: Anacharsis (4. 46. 1). For Herodotus, the fact that a people has men who are λόγιοι is somehow both a precondition and a sign of the historical depth of its traditions; their mention therefore seems to have a kind of exemplary value.

[6] For a detailed examination of these passages see Luraghi's contribution in this volume.

[7] Perhaps the λόγιοι ἄνδρες specifically mentioned in the *Histories* are not the only ones Herodotus could have qualified as such; in any case it is better to restrict the discussion to the cases explicitly mentioned by him, rather than following F. Jacoby's assumption (*Atthis* (Oxford, 1949), 215–16) that every time Herodotus refers to local informants by an ethnic name only, he actually means the λόγιοι of that ethnic group.

Herodotus' response to these traditions is to assess them carefully. This method is implicit in the definition of the inhabitants of the cultivated area of the Delta as the '*λογιώτατοι* among those of whom I have made trial' (2. 77. 1: *διάπειρα* is precisely a verification, a putting to a test, at least in intent). The other three occurrences of *διάπειρα* in the *Histories* refer to the enquiries conducted by Psammetichus regarding the antiquity of the Egyptians (2. 15. 2) and the depth of the presumed sources of the Nile near the Chrophi and Mophi mountains (28. 4), and to those tests done by Croesus concerning the veracity of the oracles when he enquired about the results of an expedition against Cyrus (1. 47. 1).[8] But above all this critical attitude is solidly at work in the opening chapters of books 1 and 2, in which Herodotus rejects as outside his province traditions ascribed to *λόγιοι ἄνδρες*. He therefore seems to define the limits of his competence *per differentiam*, by distinguishing their knowledge from his.

(2) Herodotus' refusal to deal systematically with stories about the gods (3. 2; cf. 65. 2), which is reaffirmed throughout book 2 by his unwillingness to speak about the Egyptian gods and their mythology, means, from a chronological point of view, that he is setting aside the reigns of the gods (cf. 2. 144) and limiting his historical narrative to the reigns of the human kings. Chapter 4 clarifies in detail the meaning of this *recusatio*: the original Egyptian accomplishments in the field of human affairs, to which Herodotus restricts his focus, culminate in the mention of Min, the first man to reign over Egypt. The reference to Min is Herodotus' answer to the initial problem concerning the verification of the antiquity of the Egyptians—that is, the choice of a starting-point for their history. It is worth considering carefully the succession of Egyptian achievements indicated by Herodotus in chapter 4, both because they prepare for the reference to Min and because they introduce the central themes of book 2 that are closely related, as I shall point out, to the conclusions presented in the chronological chapters of the historical section (142–6):

(4. 1) But as to human affairs, this was the account in which they all agreed: the Egyptians, they said, were the first men who reckoned by years and made the year consist of twelve divisions of the seasons. They discovered

[8] Herodotus attributes to Psammetichus and Croesus aspirations towards research that are similar to his own; see M. R. Christ, 'Herodotean Kings and Historical Inquiry', *ClAnt* 13 (1994), 167–202.

this from the stars (so they said). And their reckoning is, to my mind, a juster one than that of the Greeks; for the Greeks add an intercalary month every other year, so that the seasons agree; but the Egyptians, reckoning thirty days to each of the twelve months, add five days in every year over and above the total, and thus the completed circle of seasons is made to agree with the calendar. (4. 2) Furthermore, the Egyptians (they said) first used the names of twelve gods (which the Greeks afterwards borrowed from them); and it was they who first assigned to the several gods their altars and images and temples, and first carved figures on stone. Most of this they showed me in fact to be the case. The first human king of Egypt, they said, was Min. (4. 3) In his time all of Egypt except the Thebaic district was a marsh: all the country that we now see was then covered by water, north of Lake Moeris, which is seven days' journey up the river from the sea.

Herodotus praises the Egyptian calendar (4. 1), presenting its advantages over that of the Greeks. On the one hand, it guarantees regularity in the alternation of the seasons, contributing to that unchanging character of Egyptian civilization exalted by Herodotus (142. 4); on the other, the calendar lays excellent foundations for the Egyptian chronological reckoning performed in 142–5. Herodotus then refers to Egyptian priority in the use of the names of the twelve gods, which the Greeks are said to have taken over from them (4. 2). It is interesting that Herodotus, who elsewhere (50. 1) affirms that almost every name for the gods arrived in Greece from Egypt, here makes specific reference to *the twelve gods*, the second of the three consecutive orders of Egyptian gods mentioned by him.[9] Heracles is *the only one* of the group of the Egyptian twelve gods mentioned by Herodotus (43. 1, 4; 145. 1). He thus alludes to the problem of the dating of Heracles and of the relationship between the Egyptian and the Greek Heracles, a fundamental issue for the periodization of Egyptian history indicated by Herodotus, which is amply discussed in chapters 43 ff. , no less than in the well-known chapters on Egyptian chronology (142 ff.).

Within the same religious domain, the Egyptians are said to have been the first to assign altars, statues, and temples to the gods and to carve figures in stone (4. 2). The combined mention of altars, statues, and temples, the three components of a Greek pattern which usually underpins Herodotus' treatment of foreign religions (1. 131.

[9] J. Gwyn Griffiths, 'The Order of Gods in Greece and Egypt', *JHS* 75 (1955), 21–3 (add 2. 156. 4 to the passages quoted there).

1; 4. 59. 2, 108. 1), gains in this context an extremely precise value. Herodotus in fact believed that the possibility of going back in the past as far as the first human dynasty was proven by the existence of temples (in Memphis and Thebes) and statues (those of the high priests in Thebes) allegedly dating back to that period: here once more there is a hint to the crucial chapters 142 ff. Traditions connected to monuments have an essential role in book 2: monuments are included in the ἔργα which make it possible to challenge the destructive action of time and to extend the natural limits of human memory (see further below, Section IV). Herodotus specifies that the way in which the priests showed the truth of most of their assertions was by reference to concrete facts or objects (ἔργῳ)—this, in fact, could be a synthesis of his encounter with priests narrated in 2. 142 ff.—and concludes with their mention of Min as the first human king of Egypt, in whose times all the Nile Valley north of Lake Moeris was a huge marsh (4. 2–3).

The Egyptian achievements mentioned by Herodotus in 2. 4 indicate the foundations on which he has based his statement that Min had been the first human pharaoh. Herodotus states from the outset that his narrative of Egyptian history from Min onwards[10] is based on the accounts of the Egyptian priests (4. 1). Furthermore, he says that he went to Thebes and Heliopolis in order to see whether he would receive there accounts that agreed with those he had collected in Memphis (3. 1), and that the result of this comparison was that the priests in the three cities agreed in their accounts of Egyptian history from Min onwards (4. 1–2). With this statement, Herodotus surely intends to enhance the reliability of their accounts of that period. The same principle is used by him for the epoch of the XXVIth Dynasty (147–82), where Herodotus says that his account is based on what is said by 'other men' (that is, essentially, the Greeks), and by the Egyptians, in so far as they agree with the former (147. 1). In 2. 4. 1, however, the agreement conspicuously implies perfect correspondence between the generations of the kings as given by the priests at Memphis and the generations of high priests as given by those at Thebes (142. 1). Herodotus thereby here anticipates a crucial point of his reconstruction of pharaonic history, to which we shall return in a moment.

At the same time, in chapters 2–4, Herodotus introduces more

[10] Up to Sethus, as Herodotus will make clear further on.

essential elements for the partition of the historical space, in which Min serves as the upper chronological limit:

(1) In 4. 2, mentioning the twelve gods, and thus implicitly Heracles (the only one of them explicitly named in 43. 1), Herodotus refers to a fundamental chronological boundary, which broadly corresponds to the end of Moeris' reign (13. 1 and 145. 4). Moeris is himself indirectly alluded to, for Lake Moeris, which recalls the pharaoh by its very name and in any case owes to him its existence (101. 2; 149),[11] is the reference point used by Herodotus to show Egypt's geological situation in the time of Min.

(2) Psammetichus, who appears in chapter 2 in connection with the linguistic experiment, is the king from whose reign onwards Egyptian history is known with precision, thanks to the presence of the Greeks (154. 4). It is no accident that Herodotus attributes to him the aim of testing the trustworthiness of traditions on Egypt's antiquity (2. 1).

II

The chronological references condensed in chapters 2–4, i.e. the mention of the upper limit and of the main turning-points (Min, Moeris, Heracles, Psammetichus) of Herodotus' Egyptian history, are a crucial part of Herodotus' elaboration of the Egyptian *λόγος*. I shall now consider how these partitions actually underpin the narrative of Egyptian history in the second part of book 2 (99–182).

Herodotus' pharaonic history is introduced by a sentence usually quoted as an exemplary methodological statement: 'Thus far all I have said is the outcome of my own sight and judgement and enquiry. Henceforth I shall record Egyptian *λόγοι*, according to that which I have heard, adding thereto something of what I myself have seen. The priests told me that Min was the first king

[11] In other words, the choice of mentioning, in 4. 2, Lake Moeris—instead of e.g. Memphis (cf. 2. 13–14, showing that for Herodotus both references would be equivalent)—as a geographical reference-point to define the period of Egypt's geological history corresponding to Min's reign is probably not accidental, for it allows him also to introduce this king, who has a crucial role for the chronology, in the opening chapters; on the relationship between the name of the lake and that of the pharaoh, see A. B. Lloyd, *Herodotus, Book II: Commentary 1–98* (Leiden, New York, and Cologne, 1976), 34, and id., 'Herodotus' Account of Pharaonic History', *Historia*, 37 (1988), 22–53 at 32.

of Egypt etc.' (99. 1–2). This assertion is a concrete application of Herodotus' general principle of *λέγειν τὰ λεγόμενα* without being bound to believe them (7. 152). However, the insistence with which the reference to the priests recurs in the narrative of Egyptian history up to the Dodecarchy (chs. 99–146) is peculiar: it is as if, guaranteeing his exposition by the most *λόγιοι* of all men, but somehow also sheltering himself behind their authority (and occasionally keeping his distance from them: cf. 123. 1), Herodotus intends to stress the extraordinary nature as well as the delicacy of the task undertaken in book 2.

On a structural level, the reference in 99. 1 contributes towards distinguishing the narrative on pre-Saite Egypt, based on Egyptian *λόγοι*, from that on the Saite period, for which non-Egyptian, i.e. mainly Greek, sources are used, together with Egyptian traditions in so far as they are in agreement with Greek sources. In other words, the relationship between Greek and Egyptian traditions from Psammetichus I onward is reversed in comparison to the period before.

Finally, the opening of the narrative on pharaonic history ('The priests told me that Min was the first king of Egypt'; Min's chronological primacy is repeated in 99. 4) recalls the conclusion of chapter 4 ('The first human king of Egypt, they [i.e. the priests] said, was Min'), thereby emphasizing Min's role as a historical boundary of Herodotus' Egyptian history, as well as the fact that such a role rests on the unanimous testimony of the priests in Memphis, Heliopolis, and Thebes. The chronological backbone of Herodotus' exposition is chiefly made up of a continuous succession of kings beginning with Min. As far as the pre-Dodecarch period is concerned, each reign is said to correspond to a generation. The sequence of kings falls into three sections covering time-spans of different lengths.[12] As usual in Herodotus, the length of each time-span is directly proportional to the distance from his own time and inversely proportional to the amount of information supplied

[12] The kings from Min to Moeris; the kings down to Sethus; those from the Dodecarchs to Amasis. This at least is the structure of Herodotus' text from a chronological viewpoint. As for the narrative itself, and from the viewpoint of the traditions used as sources, the period from Min to Sethus is a unit, and is separated from the Saite period; cf. e.g. Lloyd, 'Herodotus' Account of Pharaonic History' [n. 11], 22. The chronological priority of Min, Manetho's Menes, occasionally disputed in later Greek traditions (e.g. Dicaearch. frr. 57–8 Wehrli), is confirmed by Egyptian evidence: see D. Redford, *Pharaonic King-lists, Annals and Day-books* (Mississagua, 1986).

about it. On the other hand, apart from the extraordinary length of the whole time-span, Herodotus' particular care in *defining* and *documenting with local evidence* the length of each period is quite unparalleled within the *Histories*. I shall briefly recall the relevant passages.[13]

Min is followed by 330 kings. Herodotus points out that they correspond to as many generations (100. 1; cf. 142. 1); no chronological information about the length of any single reign is given. The priests are said to have read out the names to Herodotus from a papyrus (100. 1).[14] Among all these rulers Herodotus singles out only Queen Nitocris and King Moeris, giving as a reason for his silence concerning the others the fact that no ἔργον of theirs is recorded (101. 1).[15] Moeris is expressly called the last of these kings, thereby emphasizing the role of his reign as a boundary; his recorded ἔργα are what he did for the temple of Hephaestus in Memphis and the homonymous lake. All in all, two chapters (100–1).

To the following pharaohs a little more care is devoted: eleven kings, two of whom overlap each other, in forty chapters (102–42). In their case as well the equivalence between reigns and generations is confirmed (cf. 142. 1), yet reign-lengths are occasionally given, with reference to the pyramid-builders and Sabacus. I shall return to these data below.

When he comes to the last of the eleven, Sethus, Herodotus pauses for the second time (142–6): 'Thus far went the record given to me by the Egyptians and their priests; and they showed me that the time from the first king to that priest of Hephaestus, who was the last, covered three hundred and forty-one generations of men, and that in this time such also had been the number of their kings, and of their high priests' (142. 1). Thus, a new element of the overall chronological framework is introduced: parallel to the kings runs a list of high priests, which represents the very same sequence of

[13] For a careful analysis of Herodotus' narrative see W. Kaiser, 'Zu den Quellen der ägyptischen Geschichte Herodots', *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertümer*, 94 (1967), 93–113.

[14] Actually Herodotus does not say that the list in the papyrus mentioned in 100. 1 contained only those 330 names. The relevant point, however, is that Herodotus placed a dividing-line after Moeris' reign; for this cannot be explained from the viewpoint of Egyptian history (see D. Fehling, *Herodotus and his 'Sources': Citation, Invention and Narrative Art* (Leeds, 1989), 76), but forms a crucial element in Herodotus' layout of book 2.

[15] On this point see Redford, *Pharaonic King-lists* [n. 12], 127–9.

generations.[16] The Theban origin of this list is stated immediately afterwards, in connection with the story of Hecataeus' visit to the temple of Zeus in Thebes (143). The correspondence of these two lists represents the chronological side of the agreement of the priests in Memphis, Thebes, and Heliopolis, to which Herodotus refers at the beginning of his exposition (4. 1).

Since each high priest is said to have been the son of the one who preceded him, this list is a linear genealogy, which provides a solid basis for the immediately following conversion of the 341 generations from Min to Sethus into 11,340 years (142. 2). Moreover, the wooden statues of the high priests in Thebes give firm evidence for the 341 generations, as well as for the entire Egyptian history before the Persian conquest (the 345 generations associated with Hecataeus' visit). In the same context Herodotus restates Min's function as historical starting-point of his exposition, thereby making clear that his initial *recusatio* of the *θεῖα τῶν ἀπηγημάτων* implies the refusal to deal with the period of Egyptian history before Min, i.e. with the reigns of the gods (144). Immediately afterwards Herodotus resumes the comparison between Egypt's immense *spatium historicum* and Greek traditions concerning the gods and the heroic past (145–6). I shall enter below into the details of Herodotus' argument.

Chapters 142–6 are followed by a very detailed narrative of the Saite period (147 ff.). From this point on Egyptian traditions pass by in the background, being used as far as they are in agreement with Greek ones. From a chronological point of view, the major difference is the precise indication of the reign-length for all the sovereigns: the equation reign = generation is consequently given up from Psammetichus I onwards. Therefore Herodotus, in order to state in terms of generations the length of the whole of Egyptian history before the Persian conquest, does not refer any longer to the succession of kings, but to the sequence of the Theban high priests shown to Hecataeus. The 139 years of the Saite dynasty are divided into four generations, the same four generations of high priests added in connection with Hecataeus.[17] In other words, since the general discussion about the chronological extent of Egyptian

[16] The introduction of this list is prepared, to some extent, by the fact that the last-mentioned king is himself a priest.

[17] See e.g. S. West, 'Herodotus' Portrait of Hecataeus', *JHS* 111 (1991), 144–60 at 154.

history is placed *before* the Saite dynasty (the last one before the Persian conquest), the story about the visit of Hecataeus gives Herodotus the opportunity to reckon the entire time-span covered by the history of Egypt up to Cambyses' expedition.[18]

Let us go back to the chronological frame of the account of Egyptian history before Psammetichus. The importance given by Herodotus to this periodization of Egyptian history has to be stressed: he defines precisely the length of each period (the 331 kings from Min to Moeris; the eleven further kings in ten generations from Sesostris to Sethus: altogether, 341 generations down to the Saite Dynasty, rising to 345 once the latter is included) and the pertinent evidence (a papyrus with a list of 330 names; a series of statues of high priests, one for each of the 341 generations of kings until Sethus).[19] The adoption of the equation 3 generations = 100 years, and the consequent conversion of the 341 generations into 11,340 years, enables a better estimation of this immense antiquity.[20] A definitive answer to the initial question (2. 2–3) of how old the Egyptians are (or rather, as Herodotus put it, of how much of Egyptian antiquity can be verified) is thus eventually given.

Yet other chronological data in book 2 itself concerning the kings of the Sesostris–Sethus section do not fit into this chronological frame.[21] In 13. 1 the end of the reign of Moeris, i.e. the beginning of that of Sesostris, is dated nearly 900 years before Herodotus'

[18] A similar narrative device can be seen, for example, in the quotation of the oracle about the eight generations of four Battuses and four Arcesilauses (4. 163. 2), since it allows Herodotus to make allusion to the whole extent of the Battiad monarchy, whose end in fact—both for narrative and structural/chronological reasons—falls outside the limits of his work.

[19] See above, n. 16. It is worth remarking that the written evidence provided by the papyrus, although obviously important, is not the only foundation of the reckoning.

[20] Herodotus' calculation is accurate: see Mosshammer, *The* Chronicle *of Eusebius* [n. 2], 108–9; Mitchel, 'Herodotus' Use of Genealogical Chronology' [n. 2], 63–4; and Lloyd, *Introduction* [n. 2], 177. Affirming the opposite presupposes a misunderstanding of Herodotus' process, a misunderstanding which usually goes together with an overestimation of the role of genealogical chronology in the *Histories*.

[21] On the well-known chronological problems of book 2 see Kaiser, 'Zu den Quellen der ägyptischen Geschichte Herodots' [n. 13], 96; Lloyd, 'Herodotus' Account of Pharaonic History' [n. 11], 37; Burkert, 'Lydia between East and West' [n. 2], 141, on whom see below. I confine myself to a scrutiny of the problems which are internal to Herodotus' text, and leave aside those which arise if we compare it with external data. Relevant for me is the fact that Herodotus in book 2 seems to be more interested in the general chronological framework and in the partitions which result from it than in the precise chronology of single characters (a point on which he seems sometimes perplexed: see below).

visit to Egypt ('Moeris was not yet 900 years dead when I heard this from the priests'). This would yield a date at least 300 years earlier than the one implied (reckoning 100 years for every three generations) by Moeris' position, eleven generations before Psammetichus. We face the same situation with Proteus, placed eight generations before Psammetichus: the equation 3 generations = 100 years brings us to a date about 300 years later than the one implied by the fact that the Herodotean Proteus is made contemporary with the Trojan war, expressly dated by Herodotus nearly 800 years before himself (145. 4).

These inconsistencies, far from being the result of mere carelessness, may provide a clue to the historiographical project carried out by Herodotus in book 2. Two facts need to be pointed out:

(1) the above-mentioned problems concerning Moeris' and Proteus' chronology are caused by synchronisms between pharaonic history and the Greek heroic past;
(2) Herodotus is well aware of these chronological difficulties.

Let us consider the first point. The curious dating of Moeris' death *less than 900 years* before Herodotus' visit to Egypt (13. 1) obviously recalls the dating of Heracles provided by Herodotus as part of the chronological conclusions which are drawn at the end of the account of the Sesostris–Sethus period (145. 4: 'Heracles son of Alcmene was *about 900 years* before my time'): both dates are surely approximate, yet they do make it possible for Sesostris' and Heracles' generations to be contemporary (all the more so if, as is probable, in 145. 4 Herodotus is dating *the birth* of Heracles). Moreover, in the same context Herodotus provides a date for the Trojan war (145. 4: 'Pan son of Penelope was about 800 years before me, and thus of a later date than the Trojan war'), which is coherent with the location of Proteus, the king in whose reign Herodotus places the *Τρωϊκά* (cf. 112–20), in the third generation after Sesostris: the latter's son, Pheron, is in fact Proteus' immediate predecessor.[22]

[22] The equivalence of 3 generations to 100 years applies to the distance between Sesostris and Proteus as presupposed by the synchronisms with Greek mythical chronology; for the reigns after the period from Sesostris to Sethus Herodotus depicts a different situation; see below. For the distance between Heracles and the *Τρωϊκά* see M. Piérart, 'Les dates de la chute de Troie et de la fondation de Rome: comput par génération ou compte à rebours?', in *Historia Testis: Mélanges d'épigraphie, d'histoire ancienne et de philologie offerts à Tadeusz Zawadski* (Fribourg, 1989), 13–14; Burkert, 'Lydia between East and West' [n. 2], 141–2. As for the

In other words, these dates for Moeris and Proteus belong to one and the same chronological system, which fixes a few points in the uninterrupted series of kings from Min to Sethus with reference to the Greek chronology of the heroic age. On the basis of these synchronisms, the kings from Sesostris to Sethus correspond in Greek terms to the period between the heroic and the mid-archaic age (seventh century). Now, it is only in Egypt that Herodotus is capable of narrating this period in a historical framework without gaps.[23] With the period between Sesostris and Sethus Herodotus delimits chronologically and wins over for history a part of the past which in Greece is mostly dominated by darkness, so to speak. The deep meaning of this effort resides in the typically Greek need to bridge the gap between the legendary period and the first attainable archaic past.

We have reached the core of the problem. In his narrative of Egyptian history from Min onwards, Herodotus takes care to underline in general terms the authoritativeness of Egyptian traditions and the extraordinary antiquity and continuity of the records they are based on, which conceptually amounts to the same thing. However, this past which flows steadily and uninterrupted like the Nile is divided by boundaries whose roots lie in Greek tradition. In particular, the divide between Moeris and Sesostris is fixed in time by synchronisms between Egyptian history and the Greek heroic age (Heracles, the Trojan war). Herodotus aims to stress two points at one time: the continuity of Egyptian records (owing to the uninterrupted sequence of kings and high priests) and its relevance to Greece (owing to the connections between Sesostris and Heracles and between Proteus and the *Τρωϊκά*, which make it possible for the no longer floating gap of Greek traditions between the heroic past

relationship between Egyptian history and Greek myth-history, W. A. Heidel's hypothesis (*Hecataeus and the Egyptian Priests in Herodotus, Book II* (American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Memoirs, 18/2; Boston, 1935), 74), according to which Sesostris' Colchic episode is based on a synchronism between Sesostris and the Argonauts, may probably be accepted, in the sense that Herodotus presupposes this synchronism; Heidel goes too far when he maintains that this connection goes back to Hecataeus and that Herodotus reported it without understanding this (see R. Drews's criticism, *The Greek Accounts of Eastern History* (Washington, 1973), 13).

[23] Another tradition which could have provided an equivalent chronological framework and equivalent records would have been the one concerning the Assyrian empire; but, even if Herodotus tried to use it at all, the promised *Ἀσσύριοι λόγοι*, which chronologically should have performed this role, did not reach us (see further below).

and the archaic age to be authoritatively filled). But the material Herodotus has restricts the possibility of this effort. The chronological problems I have discussed are the most obvious trace of this, and can be rephrased as follows: with the dates Herodotus gives explicitly for Moeris' death (13. 1) and implicitly for Proteus (112 ff. and 145. 4), the period between Sesostris and the Dodecarchy would last roughly six and a half centuries, much too long for the eleven kings Herodotus mentions (who would cover less than four centuries on the basis of the equation of three generations to a century).

As I anticipated, there are hints suggesting that Herodotus is aware of these chronological difficulties. In fact, the problems emerge if one applies the equation 3 generations = 100 years to the sequence of kings from Sesostris to Sethus. But Herodotus actually does not do this: immediately before converting the 341 generations of Egyptian history of the pre-Dodecarch period into years, he introduces the list of the Theban high priests. This list is said to be a continuous father–son succession (143. 3), a linear genealogy with neither *ἐς ἐμέ* dates nor synchronisms attached to it, which allows the conversion from generations into years without any further problems. The preliminary remark that the number of kings and high priests in the course of these 341 generations is the same (142. 1) aims at preserving the whole chronological structure; but such an unexpected shift from kings to high priests is, in my opinion, a clear sign of Herodotus' awareness of the problematic nature of the list of kings he gives.

The following data which Herodotus includes in his account of Egyptian history from Sesostris to Sethus (chs. 102 ff.) point in the same direction:

(1) We have already seen that, through the *implicit* synchronism with Heracles and the *explicit* one with the *Τρωϊκά*, the first three reigns span about a century; yet their lengths are not mentioned (we are only told that Pheron has been blind for ten years: 111. 2). The few instances where Herodotus gives the length of a reign for kings of this period concern the pharaohs from the pyramid-builders onwards and are all remarkably long and totally incompatible with the equivalence of 3 generations per 100 years. In particular, Cheops is allotted 50 years (127. 1), Chephren 56 years (127. 3), Sabacus 50 years (137. 2; 139. 3), and Anysis more than 50, since his reign

begins before and ends after Sabacus' invasion. Mycerinus' reign is below this average, but its shortness is explained as a punishment for his not having been the bad king he should have been: 'Egypt should have been afflicted for a hundred and fifty years, whereof the two kings before him had been aware, but not Mycerinus' (133. 3). The three reigns of the pyramid-builders were thus fated to last 150 years![24] Whatever the value of these figures may be,[25] in combination they clearly indicate rather extraordinary reign-lengths for this period, and this can hardly be unrelated to Herodotus' awareness that, on the basis of the date for Moeris given in 13. 1, the equivalence 3 generations = one century would not work for the eleven kings from Sesostris to Sethus.

(2) Although the equivalence between reign and generation is constantly reaffirmed (being a basic assumption for the greater part of Herodotus' chronological system),[26] kinship relations within this group of pharaohs are only rarely mentioned. Sesostris is Pheron's father (111. 1), Cheops is Chephren's brother (127. 1) and Mycerinus' father (129. 1).[27] This gives *a loose character* to the whole sequence of kings and consequently discourages the reader from envisaging these reigns as a continuous succession of generations to which one could apply the equation 3 generations = 100 years. The few exceptions mentioned above are easy to explain, and have a precise meaning. As for the pyramid-builders, the close connection between their reigns, which form a self-contained unit, is emphasized. In the case of Sesostris, the reference adds emphasis to the fact that he, Pheron, and Proteus belong to three successive generations, which is crucial for the synchronisms Sesostris–Heracles and Proteus–*Τρωϊκά*. In other words, it is exactly because the equivalence 3 generations = 100 years cannot be applied to the period from Sesostris to Sethus that Herodotus points out the only portion of his period, the initial one, for which the equivalence is at the same time valid and crucial.

[24] It might be added that these three reigns span only two generations, since Cheops is Chephren's brother and Mycerinus' father.

[25] Cf. Lloyd, 'Herodotus' Account of Pharaonic History' [n. 11], 35–6, and his commentary ad loc.

[26] As a matter of fact, the equivalence of one reign to one generation is undiscussed for the period Min–Moeris, becomes problematic for the period Sesostris-Sethus, and completely breaks down for the XXVIth Dynasty (and this is why Herodotus, to sum up the whole of Egyptian history in terms of generations, has to make recourse to the lists of the Theban high priests).

[27] Cf. Lloyd, 'Herodotus' Account of Pharaonic History' [n. 11], 36.

This loose character is still more obvious *e contrario* if we consider the list of the high priests in Thebes, allegedly an uninterrupted father–son succession. This fact, of course incredible, is introduced as nothing more than an instance of the general rule previously given by Herodotus in 2. 37. 5 ('Many priests, not one alone, are dedicated to the service of each god. One of these is the high priest; and when a high priest dies his son succeeds to his office'). The list of kings and the list of priests are also formally different from each other in that, unlike the sequence of kings, the list of high priests is traced *backwards* to the earliest 'from that of him who had lateliest died' (143. 3) and so that it can be opposed (*ἀντεγενεαλόγησαν*) to Hecataeus' genealogy.

(3) The date of Moeris' death in 13. 1 is the only one which is mentioned explicitly (like those of Heracles and of the *Τρωϊκά*). Therefore it acquires a strong emphasis and allows a crucial threshold of Egyptian history to be fixed in time. The different dating which would derive from converting the generations between Sesostris and Psammetichus into years would be the result of a calculation, which everything in Herodotus' text seems to discourage.

(4) In this connection, Herodotus' statement that, being a Greek, he has precise knowledge (*ἀτρεκέως*) of Egyptian history from Psammetichus onwards is not irrelevant either. As a matter of fact, this statement implies a different, less positive, assessment of the possibility of knowing and testing the trustworthiness of Egyptian history *of the period before*, from Min to Sethus (although Herodotus states that he uses for that period the best possible traditions, those of the priests of Memphis, Thebes, and Heliopolis).[28]

[28] Kaiser, 'Zu den Quellen der ägyptischen Geschichte Herodots' [n. 13], 115, sees a sign of Herodotus' awareness of the incertitude of these traditions in his frequent statements of which Egyptian sources he is drawing upon; in Rampsinitus' case there is also an explicit disclaimer (123. 1). The traditions about the pharaohs collected by Herodotus deserve some commentary. In book 2 no general information on the pharaoh as such is provided (147. 2 and 169. 4 fade in comparison with what Herodotus tells us about Spartan, Persian or Scythian kings). We find only traditions of various provenances concerning single pharaohs, from which general information on the institution can be extracted, but no explicit information such as that provided—not accidentally—about the priests (e.g. 4; 36. 1; 37. 2–5; 164. 1) or the warriors (164–6; 168). This certainly has something to do with the end of Egypt's political independence; on the other hand, it further emphasizes the role of the priests, of which the disappearance of the pharaohs is the other side of the coin, so to speak, and gives an interesting image of Egyptian society under the Persians (cf. J. Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen* (Munich, 1992], 177 ff., with observations about the function

There is still one point which must retain our attention. The chronological partitions of Egyptian history given by Herodotus have their roots in the Greek vision of the distant past, within which Heracles as well as the Trojan war are fundamental points of chronological reference. Yet the Greek Heracles and his chronology are disputed in book 2 itself. Therefore the periodization of the *spatium historicum* presented by Herodotus is Greek, but severed from direct reference to Greek tradition, whose chronological cornerstones are systematically contested, and endowed with the authoritativeness and prestige of Egyptian history and traditions. The very fact that the synchronism with Heracles can be clearly deduced from Herodotus' exposition, yet is not explicitly expressed, is a consequence of this attitude. For this reason in chapters 142–6 the chronological summing up of Egyptian history is coupled with a rehearsal of the discussion of the relationship between Greek and Egyptian religion (chs 145–6).

The Egyptian priests confront Hecataeus with a fundamental criticism.[29] The comparison between Hecataeus' genealogy and multimillennial Egyptian history does not imply only a broadening of the documentable portion of human history by the 345 generations from Min to the Persian conquest of Egypt. The comparison also implies the exclusion from this immense chronological span of the presence of gods in human form (142. 2) and of any possible birth of a man from a god (143. 4). Thus, the Egyptian priests enforce a sharp separation of gods and men, corresponding to the rigorous separation between human history, beginning with Min, and the reign of the gods before (144).[30]

of the temple as a centre of cultural memory in late Egypt which are parallel to what we see in book 2).

[29] On the meeting of Hecataeus and the Egyptian priests see recently S. West, 'Herodotus' Portrait of Hecataeus' [n. 17], 144–60; L. Bertelli, '"C'era una volta un mito. . .": Alle origini della storiografia greca', in *De tuo tibi: Omaggio degli allievi a Italo Lana* (Bologna, 1996), 49–85; R. Nicolai, '*Pater semper incertus*: Appunti su Ecateo', *QUCC*, NS. 56 (1997), 143–64. The confrontation between Egyptian and Greek traditions sometimes becomes dramatic: Herodotus' utterance in 2. 45. 3 ('So much I say of this matter; may no god or hero be displeased with me therefore') has to be taken seriously (see S. Mazzarino, *Il pensiero storico classico*, i (Rome and Bari, 1965), 154–8). Herodotus shows some uneasiness in handling this delicate topic, and the syntax of this section, not always smooth, testifies to this (cf. e.g. 2. 146).

[30] This theme is touched upon in the last verses of Hesiod's *Theogony* (930 ff. , where both Heracles and Dionysus are referred to); while the *Catalogue of Women*, also formally connected with the *Theogony*, confronts the problem of the moment from which a final separation between men and gods was enforced (fr. 204.

This separation has some consequences. The first and most serious is only implicit in Herodotus' exposition: it is the elimination of the heroes as the product of the intercourse between a god and a mortal woman. Herodotus himself suggests that this is the consequence of the premisses stated by the Egyptian priests; having endorsed the Egyptian origin of most Greek gods (50), he concludes that the Egyptians do not venerate heroes at all (50. 3; cf. also the invocation of the heroes' benevolence in 45. 3). This conclusion would of course deprive Greek aristocratic genealogies of any foundation whatsoever, genealogies which, contrary to what the priests' statues in Thebes imply, trace their origin back to a hero or god within the span of a few generations (143. 4).

Herodotus' discussion and refutation of Greek traditions concerning the births of Heracles, Pan, and Dionysus (145–6, recalling what had already been argued in 42–50) is an immediate application of this separation between men and gods. If the priests are right, Heracles cannot be the son of Zeus and Alcmena, but rather of two mortals of Egyptian origin, Amphitryon and Alcmena, who gave their son the name of an Egyptian god (43). Nor is it possible that Dionysus and Pan could be the sons of Semele and Zeus and of Penelope and Hermes respectively: the problematic traditions concerning their birth are radically questioned and interpreted as an undue confusion between their birth-dates and the moment at which the Greeks came to know about them from the Egyptians. There is therefore a difference between the criticisms of the Greek traditions concerning Heracles' birth (2. 43–5, recalled in 146. 1) and of those concerning Pan's and Dionysus' (146; regarding Dionysus, as Stein shows ad loc., the argument is implicitly anticipated in 49. 3).[31] In contrast to Pan and Dionysus, Heracles' chronology is not the result of an optical illusion, so to speak, but corresponds to a real figure, Alcmena's and Amphitryon's son.[32]

96 ff. MW). All this confirms that Hesiod's role as a polemical target of book 2 (53. 2–3) is no less important than Homer's.

[31] A feature common to Heracles, Dionysus, and Pan is that, besides being said to have been born of a god and a mortal woman, as was the rule for Greek heroes, they also were or became gods. For Heracles' and Dionysus' delicate position between heroes and gods see A. Brelich, *Gli eroi greci* (Rome, 1958), 362–8. For the problematic accounts of Pan's birth see Ph. Borgeaud, *Recherches sur le dieu Pan* (Geneva, 1979), 84 ff., and M. Jost, *Sanctuaires et cultes d'Arcadie* (Paris, 1985), 460–4.

[32] I follow the interpretation proposed by Stein in his commentary ad loc. A different interpretation is given by Lloyd, *Commentary 1–98* [n. 11], 113 ff.

In other words, about 900 years before Herodotus there is an important chronological divide; and the Greeks, if they wish to, can continue to connect it with Heracles (145).[33]

This is the paradox of book 2: Greek chronology is contested, but the partitions which divide the 'age of men' are the products of Greek culture; the existence of a hero Heracles is questioned, but the date he is given by Greek tradition corresponds to a divide in Egypt as well, namely, the transition from the period concluded by Moeris to that opened by Sesostris. Greek genealogies, with all their links to gods and heroes, are undermined, but the whole of the newly created *spatium historicum* is crossed by a new, huge genealogy, whose crucial nodes are familiar to a Greek audience. Hence we perceive, on the chronological side, a phenomenon analogous to the attribution of originally Greek traditions to Egyptian priests.[34]

III

The threefold partition of the *spatium historicum* given by Herodotus as being proper to Egyptian history—from Min to Moeris; from Sesostris to Sethus; the XXVIth Dynasty—can therefore easily be translated into a Greek way of dividing the past: there would be a most ancient period down to Heracles, a long Heraclid phase, and finally the more reliable traditions concerning archaic history. Furthermore, it was long ago pointed out that this partition applies also to Herodotus' ἀρχαιολογίαι of other non-Greek peoples. The data given in the *Histories* deserve to be recalled once more.[35]

Lydian history is threefold (cf. 1. 7). There is a long period of origins (the so-called Atyades, before whom Lydia was called the land of the Meii), then the Heraclid dynasty founded by Agron the

[33] In this way the Greek Heraclid genealogies are saved; see Herodotus' discussion at 6. 53–5: I shall deal elsewhere with these chapters and with the conflicting traditions concerning Perseus.

[34] That 'the subject of Book II is as much the Greeks as Egypt itself' has been argued by Hunter, *Past and Process in Herodotus and Thucydides* (Princeton, 1982), 50–92, whose thoughtful interpretation of book 2 as a whole is very important for the present contribution.

[35] To the bibliography cited in n. 2 above add the comprehensive discussion concerning Heracles' chronological function in Herodotus by D. Asheri in *Erodoto: Le Storie*, i (Milan, 1988), pp. xxxix–xl, and the general scheme at pp. cxii-cxiii; cf. also id., 'Herodotus on Thracian Society and History', in *Hérodote et les peuples non grecs* (Entretiens Hardt, 35; Vandœuvres-Geneva, 1990), 131–63 at 151.

son of Ninus, and finally the Mermnads. In *ἄνω Ἀσίη* the Greek chronological partition of the history of mankind corresponds to the succession of the great Near Eastern empires: the Assyrian empire founded by the Heraclid Ninus corresponds to the Heraclid phase, the Median empire to archaic history, and the Persian empire to the main Herodotean period.[36] The partition applies perhaps, albeit less obviously, to Scythian history as well. Herodotus gives three versions of the origins of this people (4. 5–12), which in their turn indicate three different starting-points for Scythian history. Now, these three starting-points correspond to the threefold partition: the first version assigns to the Scythians 1,000 years from the first king down to Darius' expedition and allows for a pre-Heraclid phase,[37] the second gives Heracles as the very beginning, and the last one simply begins with the Cimmerian invasion (seventh century). As for Persia, nine generations run from Xerxes to Achaemenes, the forefather of the Achaemenids. Herodotus has this genealogy recited in full in 7. 11. 2, while the connection to Heracles is ensured by the fact that the eponym of the Persians, Perses, is the son of Perseus and Andromeda, daughter of Cepheus (7. 61. 3, 150. 2; cf. 6. 54). The Argeads of Macedonia are connected to Heracles via Temenus (8. 137. 1), and Herodotus gives the complete genealogy of Alexander the Philhellene, the Macedonian king contemporary with Xerxes, going back seven generations up to Perdiccas, the seventh-century founder of the dynasty (8. 139). The Heraclid lineage of the Argeads, endorsed by Herodotus (5. 22), testifies to their being Greek, but of course in Greece the most important Heraclid genealogies are those of the Spartan royal families, the Agiads and the Eurypontids; Herodotus gives them in full from Heracles down to the Persian wars (in 7. 204 and 8. 131. 2

[36] The chronological scheme, according to which this history of Asia is divided into different dynasties ruling in parallel in *κάτω Ἀσίη* (i.e. Lydia) and *ἄνω Ἀσίη*, is acutely shown by Drews, 'The Fall of Astyages and Herodotus' Chronology' [n. 2], 6: 'The Halys had divided Croesus from Cyrus, the Mermnad predecessors of Croesus from the Medes, and the Heraclid Lydians from the Assyrians. Both the Assyrians and the Heraclids of Lydia traced their ancestry through Ninus, the eponymous founder of Nineveh, to Heracles. Thus the unity of Asia, realised in the career of Cyrus, had been anticipated in the person of Ninus.' Also acute, but less convincing, is Drews's hypothesis concerning the origin of this scheme, for it presupposes the systematic use of a genealogical chronology in which the generation was defined as a quarter of a century, and tends to undervalue the chronological role of Heracles.

[37] D. Asheri, 'Il millennio di Troia', in *Saggi di letteratura e storiografia antiche* (Biblioteca di Athenaeum, 2; Como, 1983), 53–98.

respectively), thus documenting Heracles' role as, one would say, a chronological interface between Greek and barbarian genealogies.

This threefold partition of the *spatium historicum*, for which Egypt gives the paradigm, as it were, should not be taken too rigidly. On the one hand, the fact that the divide associated with Heracles' chronology is relevant for the history of many different peoples, or that a connection with Heracles is in many cases possible, points to Herodotus' effort towards synchronizing the great cultures of the ancient world. The artificial traits that result are obvious. On the other hand, the reasons why, in different cultures, the period between the end of the eighth century and the first half of the seventh forms an important divide are various. In Egypt this depends on a specific event: the arrival, during the reign of Psammetichus I, of Ionian and Carian mercenaries, whose uninterrupted presence produces traditions which are more easily accessible and more trustworthy to the Greek Herodotus, allowing a more precise knowledge of Egyptian history from Psammetichus' reign onwards. But what characterizes this boundary *everywhere* is the possibility, from then on, of a seamless and uninterrupted historical memory. The fact that during the eighth century the common form of the polis acquired its fundamental traits certainly contributed to this perception.[38]

However, some particular cases need to be singled out, in which this threefold partition of the *spatium historicum* is joined by further chronological elaboration, which fixes the boundaries in time, albeit approximately. Such is the case with Egypt and with the great Near Eastern kingdoms. Egypt provides a documented framework which applies also to Lydia and to the empires of *κάτω Ἀσίη*. In fact, the chronology of the Heraclid dynasty of Lydia (1. 7. 4) and that of the Assyrian domination of Asia (1. 95. 2) are in accordance with Heracles' date as given in book 2 (145. 4). Thus the gap between Heracles and the dynasties of the archaic age is fixed in terms of

[38] 'It is more plausible perhaps to suggest that the information span revealed by Herodotus reflects the development of the polis as an institution in the period from 750 BC to 650 BC' (O. Murray, 'Herodotus and Oral History', in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg and A. Kuhrt (eds.), *Achaemenid History*, ii. *The Greek Sources* (Leiden, 1987), 93–115 at 96, repr. in this volume, pp. 16–44 at 20); for the notion of a common form of the polis see D. Musti, *Storia greca*, 2nd edn. (Rome and Bari, 1990) 79, and id., 'Linee di sviluppo istituzionale e territoriale tra Miceneo e Alto Arcaismo', in *La transizione dal Miceneo all'Alto Arcaismo: Dal palazzo alla città* (Atti del convegno internazionale, Roma, 14–19 marzo 1988; Rome, 1991), 15–33 at 32.

years. Furthermore, as is the case with the XXVIth Dynasty in Egypt, Mermnad and Median kings are provided with the lengths of their reigns.

The existence of a coherent chronological framework for Egypt, Lydia, and *κάτω Ἀσίη* makes it possible to see in a wider context the problems produced in Egyptian chronology by the synchronisms Sesostris–Heracles and Proteus–*Τρωϊκά*. If the 505 years assigned to the twenty-two generations of Heraclid kings in Lydia, as well as the 520 years of the Assyrians' domination, connect the chronology of the Lydian dynasties and that of the succession of the Assyrian, Median, and Persian empires with the pivotal date of Heracles (2. 145. 4), then one is led to suspect that the connection with Heracles might explain the very presence of these figures; in other words, that they might be the result of the reckoning of the distance between the beginning of the dynasties of the archaic age (Mermnads in Lydia and Medes in central Asia) and the Heraclid founders of the previous dynasties (Agron for the Heraclids of Lydia; Ninus for the Assyrians).

From this viewpoint, it is perhaps possible to see the chronological inconsistencies of Egyptian history between Sesostris and Sethus, a period which in fact corresponds to that of the Heraclids in Lydia and of the Assyrians in central Asia, in a clearer perspective. In Egypt the problems are obvious because Herodotus gives us all the pieces of the puzzle: the dating of Moeris' death less than 900 years before Herodotus' visit to Egypt (a date which is instrumental to a synchronism between Sesostris and Heracles) assigns almost 700 years to no more than eleven reigns. In other words, the implicit synchronism between Heracles and Sesostris implies an artificial prolongation of the period between Sesostris and the Dodecarchs, a prolongation which is somehow alluded to by the anomalous reign-lengths Herodotus gives to some kings of this period. With 3 generations every 100 years, this period could harbour twice as many kings as Herodotus actually locates in it. As for Lydia, the references are not as full. Even here, however, if we calculate 100 years for every 3 generations we have problems: 22 generations are too many for 505 years. It is therefore possible that the very connection with Heracles, which in Egypt produces an artificial extension of the period from Sesostris to Sethus, in Lydia causes a compressing of the Heraclid phase.[39] Little can be said

[39] Calculating a generation of 23 years would not do either. This had been acutely

concerning the 520 years of Assyrian domination in Asia, for we lack the corresponding number of reigns or generations. Herodotus occasionally mentions some kings, referring for complete exposition to the notorious *Ἀσσύριοι λόγοι*. Should their absence from the *Histories* be construed as a further sign of the difficulties the Greeks had in dealing with this period?

To sum up, Herodotus' chronological framework, for Lydia as well as for Egypt (but perhaps we might extend this to *κάτω Ἀσίη*) shows some massaging of the evidence—more obvious in Egypt, less blatant in Lydia—which can be traced back to the intrusion, via a synchronism, of an extraneous element, namely, Heracles' chronology, into chronological systems presumably based on local sources.[40] The meaning of this synchronism is (at least) twofold: on the one hand, it implies a unitary historical vision, thereby building the necessary chronological basis for a universal history; on the other, it makes it possible to detail and to fill the gap between the heroic and the archaic age, which is typical of Greek traditions, with the *ἀρχαιολογίαι* of other peoples.

Herodotus' narrative of this immense *spatium historicum* is underpinned by references to local sources, the scroll with the names of the 330 kings and traditions connected with monuments. But the list of the Egyptian kings is envisaged by Herodotus as an unbroken chain of generations spanning the whole of human history. It is a full genealogy, since Herodotus says that he has been given all the intervening names (2. 100. 1).[41] Herodotus' Egyptian chrono-

pointed out by Meyer, 'Herodots Chronologie der griechischen Sagengeschichte' [n. 2], 167, who remains fundamental from this point of view.

[40] Whence did Herodotus derive his dates for Heracles and the *Τρωϊκά*? This is *the* problem, an open problem indeed. Giovannini, 'La guerre de Troie entre mythe et histoire' [n. 2], Burkert, 'Lydia between East and West' [n. 2], and R. L. Fowler, 'Herodotus and his Contemporaries', *JHS* 116 (1996), 62–87 at 75, have recently proposed, with different nuances, a Lydian origin for Herodotus' chronology of Heracles, against Meyer's contention that it was calculated via the genealogies of the Spartan kings, assigning 40 years to each generation (so Asheri, *Erodoto: Le Storie*, i [n. 35]). Herodotus' chronological system is the complex result of a combination of given data (as probably the figure of 22 generations of Lydian Heraclids) and calculations, but it seems to me very difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish and prove the origins of the single elements without further evidence.

[41] See R. Thomas, *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens* (Cambridge, 1989), 157, for the definition of 'full genealogy': 'a continuous series of names from the original ancestor to the historical period, apparently complete'; see also her contribution in this volume for a complementary approach to some of the questions treated in my paper.

logy can be seen as the deceptive goal, at which the work carried out by the Greek genealogists of the sixth to fifth centuries BC had aimed—a fact that suggests that one should not underestimate Herodotus' mention of Hecataeus in this very context. Egypt provides a universal grid within which any other genealogy can be set. But this genealogization of the past is not confined to Egypt: even the most ancient section of the Lydian king-list is given as a genealogy. By contrast, the list of the Eurypontids is introduced as a genealogy, but then Herodotus states that it is in part a list of kings as well. Their case shows Herodotus' delicate play with genealogies and name-lists, his turning lists into genealogies without losing the sense of the difference between the two.

Egyptian and Near Eastern king-lists were usually provided with reign-lengths, which excluded the identification of reign and generation we meet in the *Histories*. Their reckoning formed the backbone of Egyptian and Near Eastern chronology. Herodotus' reduction of such evidence to genealogical terms is characteristic of the Greek approach to early history, or *ἀρχαιολογία*—which sees the past as being connected to heroic poetry rather than to a scribal tradition. This genealogical framework explains Herodotus' choice of Heracles as a chronological turning-point. The *Τρωϊκά* were a possible alternative and, not surprisingly, in book 2 there is a long digression on the Trojan war, whose date, like Heracles', is here given explicitly by Herodotus.

IV

The reigns of Min, Moeris, and Psammetichus, the three partitions of Egyptian history marked by Herodotus, underpin a periodization which has been conceived by the historian in the framework of Greek tradition and history. This way of reducing the history of a different culture to notions belonging to the author's experience is a common feature of historiography of any time.[42] Herodotus lays Egyptian history out in a way which would have been familiar

[42] Think, for example, of the application, proposed *inter alios* by E. Meyer, of the notion of 'Middle Ages' to the period between the Mycenaean and the archaic; see now I. Morris, 'Periodization and the Heroes: Inventing a Dark Age', in M. Golden and P. Toohey (eds.), *Inventing Ancient Culture: Historicism, Periodization, and the Ancient World* (London and New York, 1997), 96–131.

to a Greek audience, and at the same time he confers a universal relevance upon the Greek partitions of the past. This second aspect is Herodotus' original contribution in book 2, although it is impossible to say precisely what in book 2 is original and what is traditional.

The Egyptian records endow the Greek's partition of the past with a greater authority—it comes to be supported by the *λογιώτατοι πάντων ἀνθρώπων*!—and lay the basis of its universality, which is confirmed by precise recurrences of this partition in Herodotus' narrative of the history of the most important eastern and western civilizations. His insistence on reconnecting this partition to Egyptian sources, i.e. the priests and the records they exhibit, has no parallels in the *Histories*. This contributes to a great extent to the complexity of book 2, and, in many senses, of the *Histories* as a whole. This founding role of Egypt in the construction of a universal history, as documented by Herodotus, was destined to be an encumbering heritage for the further development of this branch of Greek historiography.[43]

The importance of the threefold partition of the past is confirmed by its role in the first section of book 2, concerning Egyptian geography and the Nile (2. 5–35).[44] Just after mentioning the upper chronological limit of Egyptian history, embodied by Min, Herodotus establishes a connection between Min's date and Egyptian geological history: 'In his [i.e. Min's] time all Egypt save the Thebaic province was a marsh: all the country that we now see was covered by water, north of Lake Moeris' (2. 4. 3). As Herodotus hastens to explain, the progressive expansion of the Egyptian land is a consequence of the Nile's alluvial deposits, which in the course of time—that is, as far as it is possible to record, starting from Min—have created the whole area which the Greeks reach by sea. The mil-

[43] The idea that 'what distinguishes the Second Book of Herodotus is the attempt to create a basis for universal history' is central to Heidel's essay *Hecataeus and the Egyptian Priests in Herodotus* [n. 22] (cf. e.g. 116 and 108 n. 187), and is mostly based on the appreciation of the synchronisms between Egyptian history and events of the Greek legendary past; his further step, attributing the whole of this construction to Hecataeus, cannot be accepted. On Egypt's role for universal history in the ancient world see A. Momigliano, 'The Origins of Universal History', in *Settimo contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico* (Rome, 1984), 77–103 at 89.

[44] For an introduction to these chapters see G. F. Gianotti, 'Ordine e simmetria nella rappresentazione del mondo', *QS* 14 (1988), 51–91; the best general work on Herodotus' geography is Ch. van Passen, *The Classical Tradition of Geography* (Groningen, 1957), 71–211.

lenarian activity of the river becomes the backbone of Herodotus' geographic chapters, and gives them a historical depth. If the alluvial deposits of the Nile, from Min's time onwards, have little by little formed the Egyptian land from the Moeris lake to the seashore, then going upstream from the coast is a trip backwards in Egyptian history; at the end, the discussion of the Nile's springs (28–34) balances that of the antiquity of the Egyptians at the beginning of book 2. Furthermore, since 'the Egypt the Greeks sail to' is a gift of the river, then measuring the Egyptian coast expresses in terms of space the chronological reference Herodotus gave in 2. 4. 3: 60 *σχοῖνοι*, equivalent to 3,600 stades, is the length of that piece of land the Nile itself has produced in the long time between Min and Herodotus.

In this connection, chapter 6 is particularly relevant. After indicating in 60 *σχοῖνοι* the length of the Egyptian coast, Herodotus comments: 'Men that have scanty land measure it by fathoms; those that have more, by stades; those that have much land, by parasangs; and those who have great abundance of it, by *σχοῖνοι*' (2. 6. 2–3). The different units of length are chosen with reference to concrete realities: the only *γεωπεῖναι* Herodotus mentions are the Andrians (8. 111. 3); stades relate to Greece, parasangs to the Persian empire, and *σχοῖνοι*—the unit of those who have immense amounts of land—are explicitly qualified as the Egyptian unit, and remind the audience that Egypt is boundless, in space as well as time.

The conversion of the length from *σχοῖνοι* to stades is the equivalent of the conversion of the 341 generations of Egyptian history from Min to the XXVIth Dynasty into years. In this second case, the conversion is made possible via the equivalence of 100 years to three generations—which form a unit of measure for memory, as it were, empirically based and familiar to the Greeks.

In book 2 there is a close correspondence between the chapters concerning Egypt's history and those concerning its geography. Thanks to the Nile, the Egyptian land grows continuously, and the measure of this growth is a translation of Egyptian history into geographical terms. In other words, the activity of the Nile can be followed during the whole of Egyptian history, as Herodotus makes clear by connecting it exactly with the three great historical partitions, represented by Min, Moeris, and Psammetichus. The connection with Min comes at the very beginning (2. 4. 3; see above). Moeris is linked to the Nile because during his reign the

whole area below Memphis used to be flooded when the river rose only eight cubits, 'and when I got this information,' Herodotus adds, 'Moeris had been dead for less than 900 years' (2. 13. 2). As for Psammetichus, his role is particularly interesting. Therefore I shall, as Herodotus would say, dwell upon him somewhat longer.

In book 2 Psammetichus performs a twofold function, positive and negative, in indicating the limits of the possibilities of knowledge both (1) in the chronological and (2) in the geographical sphere. In both these areas, in fact, on the one hand, (*a*) he has fixed, through a political-military initiative, the limits of that which can be known with certainty, on the other hand, (*b*) he has also attempted in vain to travel these limits of human knowledge to their extreme end.

(1) First, the chronological sphere. (*a*) Thanks to the Ionians and Carians gathered in Egypt by Psammetichus and made to settle by him after he had won power, 'we Greeks', says Herodotus, have an accurate knowledge of Egyptian history from the times of Psammetichus onwards (2. 154. 4; cf. 147. 1). As a consequence of Psammetichus' initiative of settling Greeks and Carians in Egypt, his reign is also a partition in so far as the reliability of the tradition is concerned. (*b*) On the other hand, Psammetichus is said to have tried to verify whether the Egyptians were truly the most ancient of all peoples—that is to say, he tried to go back to the ultimate origin of human history. The linguistic experiment he organizes to this end has, however, a doubtful outcome.

(2) Second, the geographical sphere. (*a*) The αὐτομόλοι—the Deserters, descendants of a garrison sent by Psammetichus to Marea and after a few years gone over to the Ethiopians (2. 30)—constitute the most remote point concerning which Herodotus, travelling upstream along the Nile, can gather reliable information: beyond them, nobody knows the course of the Nile with any certainty (2. 31). (*b*) On the other hand, according to a tradition Herodotus attributes to the notorious scribe of the sacred treasury of Athena in Sais—referred to by the historian with much reserve,[45]—Psammetichus would have tried without success to reach the bottom of the sources of the Nile near the Crophi and Mophi mountains (2. 28. 4). Herodotus relates this tradition just at the

[45] Herodotus' perplexities concern above all the fact that the source of the Nile could be found near the mountains Crophi and Mophi, more than the question whether Psammetichus would really have completed his experiment there.

very beginning of his discussion of the problem of the sources of the Nile (28–34), contrasting once more Psammetichus' ambitions and his own aim to circumscribe what is actually knowable and verifiable.

In the passages concerning the Nile, the ἐργατικός river par excellence, the diachronic dimension is essential. Since the Nile operates in the long run of Egyptian time, it is possible to state some correspondences between the stages of the Nile's activity and the chronological turning-points of pharaonic history. The relevance of these turning-points to the geological history of Egypt, as brought about by the Nile, confirms their importance and somehow contributes to the establishment of their general value.

The Nile is in fact one of the protagonists of Herodotus' *Histories*. Having shown that the Delta of Egypt is, as everyone knows, a gift of the Nile—a pregnant expression, whose meaning, often trivialized, is much more than a merely geological one—Herodotus adds: 'there are other rivers too I could mention, much smaller than the Nile, which have effected great changes [*more literally:* which have performed great ἔργα]; for instance, the Achelous which flows through Acarnania and has already joined to the mainland half of the islands of the Echinades group' (2. 10). Herodotus is comparing 'the great and marvellous ἔργα performed by Greeks and barbarians', as he put it in the proem.

Moreover, there are some interesting consequences to be drawn from the fact that Herodotus qualifies the Nile as ἔργα ἀποδεξάμενος μεγάλα. The meaning of ἔργα in Herodotus' proem has been much disputed.[46] A related problem is that of distinguishing the two negative final clauses of the proemial sentence (which is more difficult if one understands ἔργα as *res gestae*). The best translation of ἔργα is perhaps the Latin word *opera*, which means both activities and the result of these activities. ἔργα includes not only monuments, but also every concrete result of a natural or human activity. An essential distinction between τὰ γενόμενα ἐξ ἀνθρώπων and ἔργα is that, while the first are performed by men and Herodotus' main concern with them is that they may fade away in time, ἔργα can be more durable products of human or natural agents. In other words, ἔργα better resist the corrosive action of time; in their case, the role of the historian seems to be that of keeping alive their ἄφθιτον κλέος. What

[46] See H. R. Immerwahr, 'Ergon: History as a Monument in Herodotus and Thucydides', *AJPh* 81 (1960), 261–90.

I am suggesting here is that a fundamental difference between *τὰ γενόμενα ἐξ ἀνθρώπων* and *ἔργα* is their relation to time, their ability to challenge time and its action. Considered from this point of view, the distinction Herodotus makes in the proem can be viewed as one between human deeds, whose memories, if not entrusted to written records, tend not to survive the well-known, so to speak, biological, empirical limit of three generations, and works (*opera*), which allow transcendance of this chronological boundary. This contrast between the limited time span of three generations and the wider chronological field of human history is in fact attested in Herodotus' work: in chapters 2. 142–3 the basic historiographical unit of three generations, the average length of the memory of a man, as well as the limit beyond which *τὰ γενόμενα ἐξ ἀνθρώπων* tend to fade away, is implicitly confronted with the 341 generations of Egyptian history before Psammetichus, and used as a basis for calculating how many years correspond to 341 generations. These 341 generations are at the same time the entire verifiable human history before that king: an enormous *spatium historicum*, within which Herodotus tries to document a temporal partition originating from Greek culture, a partition that, as I suggested, offers itself as a paradigm for other histories too. Within this field the history of the 'short century' of conflicts between Greeks and barbarians is also embedded: the history of the three generations from Croesus to the Persian wars to which Herodotus specifically devotes his work.[47]

[47] In this connection it should not be forgotten that, within the XXVIth Dynasty, Herodotus devotes much more space to Amasis than to the preceding pharaohs; Amasis is in fact the only Egyptian king to whom Herodotus dedicates a unitary *λόγος*, comparable to those dedicated e.g. to Croesus or Darius. Now, Amasis is also the first Egyptian pharaoh whose reign falls inside the period of three generations Herodotus explicitly chooses as the theme of the *Histories*. In other words, Herodotus' chronological delimitation of his topic remains relevant even in the Egyptian *λόγος*, albeit in the framework of a chronological system and of historiographical problems which are exceptional in the *Histories*.

12

The Beginning of Chronography: Hellanicus' *Hiereiai*

ASTRID MÖLLER

When the Greeks began to write historiography, they structured the past in a variety of ways, according to the layout and purpose of their work. In Herodotus time does not exist independently of the narrative. He did not arrange the received traditions so as to create a continuous narrative by a separately worked out chronology, but made extensive use of flashbacks and digressions to keep together the different focuses of his interests. Thucydides, by contrast, arranged his whole narrative according to the summers and winters of particular years. Here time serves as an autonomous structure.[1] Besides the work of these two great historians, there existed a different kind of historiography which attempted to string events along the chain of calendar years, identified by eponymous officials or priests, hence *κατ' ἐνιαυτόν*. Here, time dominated the structure of the historical narrative. Unfortunately, works of this kind of historiography have only come down to us in fragments, making it difficult to determine their original shape. It is often impossible to say whether a particular work was written on an annalistic pattern, i.e. on a year-by-year structure,[2] or was simply a kind of historical narrative using some chronographical dates.[3]

I am very grateful to the editor for his valuable suggestions and to Penny Maddrell for improving the English text.

[1] Cf. A. Möller and N. Luraghi, 'Time in the Writing of History: Perceptions and Structures', *Storia della storiografia*, 28 (1995), 3–15 at 12–13. That Thucydides' system of dating was regarded as rather idiosyncratic is clear from Dionysius of Halicarnassus' critique in *Thuc*. 9.

[2] By 'annalistic pattern' I wish to emphasize the outer shape, not necessarily implying that they were indeed edited versions of official annual records.

[3] Chronographical dates for the archaic period mean dates constructed without

As these annalistic works were not preserved in their entirety, it would appear that they were not accorded a high degree of literary value. The authors using them tended to extract only single facts according to their interests, so we can easily be misled regarding the original shape of the work in question.

1. *Felix Jacoby's Genres of Chronography and Horography and his First Chronographer*

In 1909 Felix Jacoby set out his taxonomy of the Greek historiographical genres, promoting his new collection of fragments organized according to the genetic principle.[4] While his developmental theory of the Greek historiographical genres starting with Hecataeus' genealogical and geographical work and leading to Herodotus' *Histories* is generally accepted, his assumption that horography and chronography came only after Herodotus is now increasingly being challenged.[5] The term 'horography' was chosen by Jacoby as a *terminus technicus*, following ancient sources such as Diodorus, Censorinus, Hesychius, and the *Etymologicum Magnum*, to denote the local histories of Greek poleis written in an annalistic manner.[6] Jacoby emphasized the sharp contrast between horography as a literary genre and the official, but unliterary, *ἀναγραφαί*, which he believed could be detected as early as the eighth century BC. These literary versions had usually, though not always, followed the official *ἀναγραφαί* of eponymous officials.[7]

reference to an already existing chronological standard, cf. A. A. Mosshammer, *The* Chronicle *of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition* (Lewisburg, Pa., 1979), 85 ff.

[4] F. Jacoby, 'Ueber die Entwicklung der griechischen Historiographie und den Plan einer neuen Sammlung der griechischen Historikerfragmente', *Klio*, 9 (1909), 80–123, repr. in id., *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtsschreibung*, ed. H. Bloch (Leiden, 1956), 16–64.

[5] R. Fowler, 'Herodotos and his Contemporaries', *JHS* 116 (1996), 62–87 at 65 ff.

[6] D.S. 1. 26. 5; Cens., *De die nat.* 19. 6; Hesych. s.v. *ὡρογράφοι*; *EM* 823. 48, s.v. *ὦρος*.

[7] Jacoby, *Klio*, 9: 109 ff. = *Abhandlungen*, 49 ff. In his commentary on *Zeittafeln* in *FGrHist* IIB (1930), 661–2, *ἀναγραφή* denotes the 'amtliche chronikführung': he saw a connection between the literary chronicle and 'der durchaus unliterarischen, ganz praktisch-politischen aufzeichnung der beamtenliste, die nicht nur die eponymen enthält (mit denen sich die chronik meist begnügt), sondern die ganzen kollegien. durch sachliche notizen faktischer art erheben sich schon die ältesten uns bekannten

Chronography constituted another of Jacoby's historiographical genres of the fifth century BC. Jacoby's idea of chronography becomes apparent in his description of Hellanicus' Ἱέρειαι τῆς Ἥρας αἱ ἐν Ἄργει as belonging by its outer shape to horography and by content to genealogy and ethnography, even to the πράξεις Ἑλληνικαί. Jacoby emphasized that the *Hiereiai* did not represent the chronicle of a single city, but of the whole of Hellas, starting therefore the new genre of chronography. He maintained that this kind of historiography had to be distinguished from horography, since its scope was different, although both shared the annalistic form and dated by eponyms. While horography was essentially local in content and form, chronography was universal and soon began to take the shape of synchronistic tables, losing the outward similarity to horography.[8] There was not much literary connection between the two genres, apart from their being modelled on the official ἀναγραφαί. Thus far Jacoby in 1909.[9]

By 1949 Jacoby's ideas about the sources of horography, the most obvious example from the mother country represented for him by the *Atthides*, had radically changed.[10] Jacoby had set out to prove that the *Atthis*, i.e. the local history of Athens, as written by Athenians between *c.*350 and 263 BC, did not derive from an old and semi-official chronicle kept by the priestly board of ἐξηγηταί and subsequently published by the 'Anonymous of 380 BC', from which

amtlichen listen . . . zu einer wenn auch noch so knappen und ungleichmäßigen chronik' ('the quite unliterary, practical-political recording of lists of officials, which not only contained the eponyms (usually sufficient for the chronicle), but the whole *collegia*. By the addition of notes of a factual kind, even the oldest lists known to us . . . reach the level of a chronicle, however short and uneven'). In 1949 Jacoby admitted that he was no longer so confident about the early parts of name-lists: *Atthis: The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens* (Oxford, 1949), 353 n. 3. In *Atthis* he regarded ἀναγραφαί as synonymous with lists—cf. 177 and the index s.v. *anagraphai*.

[8] Chronography thus becomes an essentially hellenistic phenomenon (cf. Jacoby, *Klio* 9: 107 ff. = *Abhandlungen*, 46 ff.): Eratosthenes wrote his *Chronographiai*, Apollodorus and Castor their *Chronika*—the latter started to synchronize oriental, Greek, and Roman events—to name but the most famous. The extensive chronographical literature of the hellenistic period culminated in the *Chronicle* of Eusebius in the 4th cent. AD, representing the highest development of Greek chronographical tradition. In *FGrHist* IIB Jacoby gave under 'D. *Zeittafeln*' a collection of *chronika* etc. (nos. 239–61), interspersed with unnumbered authors dealt with under different headings. Mosshammer, *The* Chronicle *of Eusebius*, 98 ff., gives a useful account of authors contributing to the growth of chronographic tradition.

[9] Jacoby, *Klio* 9: 87–8 with n. 3 = *Abhandlungen*, 24–5 with n. 26; cf. *FGrHist* IIB (Berlin, 1930), 661–2, on the difference between horography and chronography.

[10] Jacoby, *Atthis*, p. v, cf. *FGrHist* IIIb suppl. (Leiden, 1954), 2.

all following *Atthides* derived, as Wilamowitz had argued.[11] In Jacoby's view it had been created in the lifetime of Thucydides by the foreigner Hellanicus of Lesbos. With the same vigour, Jacoby denied the existence of pre-literary chronicles in Ionia.[12] After carefully discussing the possibility of their existence and pointing out that the surviving epigraphical lists of eponymous officials do not contain annotations, he inferred that pre-literary chronicles, i.e. lists with names and events, were unlikely to have existed at all. Thus he asserted that 'the nature of these later inscriptions and the notes in the lists of eponymous officials are widely different from the idea formed of the archaic list, which is supposed to have contained brief but numerous notes of all sorts of events of public interest'.[13] Jacoby concluded, after examining further evidence, that historical annotations in eponymous lists were neither usual nor traditional in Greece, nor did the custom of making annotations develop in times when a historical interest existed. Therefore lists of eponymous officials and city chronicles (whether literary or pre-literary) served different purposes and there can have been no early and close connection between them.[14] Having separated the lists of eponymous officials from other records called chronicles, i.e. of an annalistic kind, Jacoby made it quite clear that horography developed neither from lists nor from pre-literary chronicles.[15]

Even if horography did not develop from lists or pre-literary chronicles, it has been claimed that it adopted an annalistic pattern. However, this is difficult to verify, owing to the fragmentary character of the evidence, and is mainly suggested by the title *Hōroi*, 'yearbooks'.[16] The fragments of the earliest local history do not show an annalistic pattern, nor is there any indication that they depended on official records, which prompted von Fritz to argue for a distinction between local history and local chronicle.[17]

But what of the beginning of chronography? The annalistic pat-

[11] U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Aristoteles und Athen* (2 vols.; Berlin 1893), i. 260 ff., 280–1.

[12] Jacoby, *Atthis*, 178 ff.

[13] Ibid. 179.

[14] Ibid. 181.

[15] Ibid. 172, 176, discussed the Athenian archon-list as a possible historical source for the Atthidographers, but did not treat it as a framework determining the form.

[16] Although the Ionian chronicles are cited as Ὧροι, we lack a clear idea of their shape; cf. Fowler, 'Herodotos and his Contemporaries' [n. 5], 66 n. 28.

[17] K. von Fritz, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung* (2 vols.; Berlin, 1967), i. 96–7, ii. 74–5 n. 80. Cf. A. Momigliano, review of L. Pearson, *The Local Historians of Attica* (Philadelphia, 1942), in *Quinto contributo alla storia degli studi classici*, ii (Rome, 1975), 927–9, where he claimed that the general problem of the relation

tern seems quite naturally suited to the particular kind of writing which attempts to date events. However, chronography cannot have developed from collecting *Hōroi*, since they probably did not yet exist. Jacoby considered it doubtful that Hellanicus, to him the first chronographer, already knew literary *ἀναγραφαί*, i.e. *Hōroi*;[18] in his view Hellanicus wrote local histories and ethnographical works, and was certainly not engaged in 'editing the chronicles of his *Heimat*'.[19] Since we cannot be too sure about the kind of documentary evidence that might support the existence of either horography or chronography, we had better put aside the search for such evidence and proceed by looking for the roots of the annalistic pattern adopted by the first chronographer, Hellanicus.

When Jacoby set out the framework for his *Fragmente* in 1909,[20] he assigned Hellanicus of Lesbos a place between the old genealogists and those of the hellenistic period. He held that Hellanicus could not be put among the pure genealogists, nor among the ethnographers or *περιηγηταί*, nor among the horographers, since he practised and perfected all the genres that developed during the fifth century BC. To Jacoby, Hellanicus was the first to aspire to a universal history, though he did not set out a unified framework. Instead, he dealt with the different periods and areas in works of diverse character. However, Jacoby drew attention to a special kind of historiographical work, the *Hiereiai*, which surpassed the other known genres by virtue of its peculiarity and shaped a new type of historiography: the chronography.

Hellanicus' *Karneonikai*, which Jacoby grouped together with the *Atthis* and the *Hiereiai* because of its chronicle-like shape,[21] does not display an annalistic pattern and could equally well have been a history of music, judging from the remaining three fragments:[22]

between chronicle and history in Greece is essential to the understanding of the whole development of European historiography.

[18] Jacoby, *Klio*, 9: 88 n. 3=*Abhandlungen*, 25 n. 26. This assumption, however, depends greatly on the dating of Charon of Lampsacus, who was dated by Jacoby to the time after Herodotus, and on the understanding of his *Prytaneis* (see below).

[19] Jacoby, 'Hellanikos', *RE* viii/1 (1912), 104–53 at 133.

[20] Jacoby, *Klio*, 9: 87–8 with n. 3=*Abhandlungen*, 24–5. with n. 26. In *FGrHist* Hellanicus was actually assigned no. 4 among the genealogists; later his *Atthis* was given no. 323a, the first of the Atthidographers, and his local histories were arranged under nos. 601a (*Thessalika*), 608a (*Aigyptiaka*), and 687a (*Persika*); there is also 645a *εἰς Ἄμμωνος ἀνάβασις* (=4 F 56).

[21] Jacoby, 'Hellanikos' [n. 19], 138.

[22] Jacoby, *FGrHist* 1a 458; in 'Hellanikos' [n. 19], 143, he compared it to the

F 85a (ap. Athen. 14, 635 E) tells us that Terpander was the first to win the *Karneia* at Sparta; F 85b (ap. Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1. 21. 131. 6) dates Terpander to the time of Midas;[23] and F 86 (ap. Σ Ar. *Av.* 1403b Holwerda) states that Arion set up the *κύκλιοι χοροί*. The last fragment reveals that the work was more than a catalogue of victors. Hellanicus displays a typically Greek interest in the question of the *πρῶτος εὑρετής*, perhaps cataloguing and bringing into chronological order all the poetical and musical *εὑρήματα*.[24] But there is no satisfactory information indicating a chronographical character for this work. The title *Karneonikai* rather suggests a list of victors, probably together with a historical introduction from which the fragments might be taken.

Hellanicus' *Hiereiai*, however, provide a much better impression. We have Dionysius of Halicarnassus' description—instructive even though it does not name Hellanicus—'he who put together the priestesses of Hera at Argos and what happened during their respective periods of office says . . .'.[25] From this passage we can conclude either that Hellanicus connected the priestesses of Hera at Argos with the events or that he also gathered the names of the priestesses themselves. The annalistic pattern is supported by the only fragment which gives explicit evidence for dating by the Argive priestesses of Hera. F 79b (ap. D.H. *AR* 1. 22) relates that the Sicels left Italy three generations before the Trojan war, in

roughly contemporary books of Glaucus of Rhegium *Περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων ποιητῶν καὶ μουσικῶν* and Damastes of Sigeium *Περὶ ποιητῶν καὶ σοφιστῶν*. Athenaeus (F 85a) tells us of two versions, one in prose and one in verse; the metrical version is corroborated by the *Suda*, s.v. *Ἑλλάνικος*, where many works in prose and verse are mentioned. Some scholars assumed that the metrical version was probably made later to aid the memory, but Jacoby, 'Hellanikos', 143, concluded that this assumption was unnecessary, on the basis of a comparison of the verse version with Critias' metrical *Politeiai* (cf. Jacoby, *FGrHist* IIa 458) and the sophistic manner intended to impress the public.

[23] It is not clear whether Hellanicus, if Clement was right in his ascription, invented this synchronism or where he got it from; cf. von Fritz, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung* [n. 17], ii. 232–3. n. 79; D. Ambaglio, 'L'opera storiografica di Ellanico di Lesbo', in *Ricerche di storiografia antica*, ii (Pisa, 1980), 9–192 at 146.

[24] Cf. A. Kleingünther, *Πρῶτος εὑρετής: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte einer Fragestellung* (*Philologus*, suppl. 26; Leipzig, 1934), 137 ff.

[25] D.H. *AR* 1. 72 (=*FGrHist* 4 F 84) *ὁ δὲ τὰς Ἱερείας τὰς ἐν Ἄργει καὶ τὰ καθ' ἑκάστην πραχθέντα συναγαγὼν . . . φησίν*. L. Pearson, *The Early Ionian Historians* (Oxford, 1939), 231, translates: 'the writer who made up the list of priestesses in Argos and the events belonging to the time of each of them'.

the 26th year of Alcyone, priestess at Argos.[26] Perhaps this allows us to understand Hellanicus' method of building a chronological framework: in this particular case, it looks suspiciously as though either he took the three generations before the Trojan war from Herodotus (7. 171), or they both used a common source on Minos and the Cretans in Italy. Herodotus dates the beginning of the Trojan war three generations after the death of Minos, following a digression on Minos and the fate of the Cretans in Italy and Sicily.[27] We may therefore presume that for early times Hellanicus either found a reference to generations or otherwise calculated the time of an event himself, combining it with the name and year of office of a priestess of Hera. Jacoby, on the contrary, held the view that Hellanicus added the generations as a quicker, more imaginative, way for his public to orient themselves in time.[28]

Apart from the impression we get of Hellanicus' chronographical method, we cannot ascertain the kind of evidence he relied on, since Dionysius, in the passage quoted above, does not necessarily imply that Hellanicus used a ready-made list he might have found at the sanctuary. If we take Dionysius' remarks in his work on Thucydides, we may perhaps infer that he believed that Hellanicus had written material at hand. Dionysius wrote, of the sources of the *ἀρχαῖοι συγγραφεῖς*, that they had used oral traditions preserved among the local people (*παρὰ τοῖς ἐπιχωρίοις μνήμαι*) or written records (*γραφαί*) preserved in sacred or profane archives.[29] However, the interpretation of this passage and the particular meaning of *γραφαί* are far from being settled,[30] and in any case we must consider

[26] Cf. von Fritz, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung* [n. 17], i. 493 with n. 71; Pearson, *The Early Ionian Historians* [n. 25], 217 ff.

[27] The distance of three generations between Minos and the Trojan war was, however, to be found in the *Iliad* (13. 449–52).

[28] Jacoby, 'Hellanikos' [n. 19], 147. Von Fritz, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung* [n. 17], i. 492, held that Hellanicus first made calculations according to generations and only then referred to the list.

[29] D.H. *Thuc.* 5 (ed. Aujac); cf. W. K. Pritchett, *Dionysius of Halicarnassus:* On Thucydides (Berkeley, 1975), 3 and nn. 53–4; von Fritz, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung* [n. 17], ii. 75 n. 80; Fowler, 'Herodotos and his Contemporaries' [n. 5], 62–3, for text and translation.

[30] Jacoby, *Atthis* [n. 7], 178, held that Dionysius was speaking in quite general terms in this passage, not positively affirming the significance of *γραφαί* as documentary evidence (Jacoby, however, did not deny the existence of any documentary evidence), and he interprets *γραφαί* as written records in the 'normal meaning'. D. L. Toye, 'Dionysius of Halicarnassus on the First Greek Historians', *AJPh* 116 (1995), 279–302 at 296, proposes to understand *γραφαί* as referring to ancient epics

that Dionysius is likely to have used what had become the normal practice in his own day to derive an inference about a time when circumstances and conditions were quite different.

There are twelve fragments from the *Hiereiai* which are quoted with the title.[31] It appears from these that the work was divided into at least three books. Unfortunately, only Stephanus of Byzantium and Dionysius of Halicarnassus explicitly state that they draw on it. The latter quotes Hellanicus twice in his *Antiquitates Romanae* at the end of the first century BC, once on Sicilian matters and once on the κτίσις of Rome, thus providing us with presumably the first attempt to connect Aeneas with the foundation of Rome.[32] In accordance with the interests of Stephanus of Byzantium, the quotations handed down by him deal mainly with topographical notes, ethnography, and etymology (FF 74–8, 80), some with the remote or recent past (FF 79a–b, 81, 83), some with genealogies (F 74) and κτίσεις (F 82).[33]

From Dionysius' description quoted above we can infer that this work, narrating events by reference to priestesses, was a chronographical compilation. This fact is not easily established solely from the extant fragments themselves. It is also apparent that Hellanicus did not use the Argive priestesses of Hera as a chronological device to write a local history of Argos, but dealt with events on a universal scale. Given his categorization, Jacoby was quite right to put the *Hiereiai* under the heading of chronography, because of its universal character, as opposed to horography, which dealt with local matters.[34]

and oracles circulating in the late 6th and 5th cents. which could have been thought of as sources used by the ἀρχαῖοι συγγραφεῖς.

[31] *FGrHist* 4 FF 78–84; Ambaglio, 'L'opera storica di Ellanico di Lesbo' [n. 23], frr. 150–60; J. J. Caerols, *Helánico de Lesbos: Fragmentos* (Madrid, 1991), frr. 78–84.

[32] *FGrHist* 4 F 79b ap. D.H. *AR* 1. 22 (cf. below); F 84 ap. D.H. *AR* 1. 72 (cf. C. Ampolo, 'Enea ed Ulisse nel Lazio da Ellanico (*FGrHist* 4 F 84) a Festo (432L)', *PdP* 47 (1992), 321–42, for older bibliography, esp. 323 n. 3; K. Galinski, *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome* (Princeton, 1969), 106–13, on Stesichorus and the Trojan legend in Sicily). F. Solmsen, '"Aeneas Founded Rome with Odysseus"', *HSCPh* 90 (1986), 93–110 at 108–9, thinks that the absence of any explicit chronological reference in this passage reduces the likelihood of arbitrary invention by Hellanicus.

[33] Cf. Pearson, *The Early Ionian Historians* [n. 25], 21. More on Hellanicus' etymologies in Fowler, 'Herodotos and his Contemporaries' [n. 5], 72–3 with nn. 77–8.

[34] *Pace* Toye, 'Dionysius of Halicarnassus on the First Greek Historians' [n. 30], 291–2, who considers this work to be a collection of κτίσεις, an assumption already criticized by Fowler, 'Herodotos and his Contemporaries' [n. 5], 75 n. 102.

2. *In Search of the Annalistic Pattern*

In our search for the origin of the annalistic pattern in Greek historiography, i.e. writing *κατ' ἐνιαυτόν*, we should begin in Greece by looking for a literary tradition using it. Unfortunately, the evidence available is meagre and fragmentary, merely inviting speculation. Ion of Chios, a contemporary of Herodotus, wrote a *Foundation of Chios* which does not display any annalistic character.[35] The only historian of the mid-fifth century BC who might have used official chronicle-like records is Xanthus the Lydian. However, the fragmentary condition of his work and the ways it was handed down to us make it difficult to judge its original shape. Von Fritz's proposal, since generally accepted, was to distinguish between those fragments more likely to be traced back to Xanthus' *Lydiaka* and those in the work of Nicolaus of Damascus more likely to rely on hellenistic versions.[36] It is therefore difficult to know with any certainty whether the remark that the royal records made no mention of the usurper Spermus[37] can be interpreted as making it likely that Xanthus used such records as evidence. In any event, his *Lydiaka* was certainly not written on an annalistic pattern; whatever records he may have used, they were not Greek.

Charon of Lampsacus, included by Dionysius of Halicarnassus in the first group of *ἀρχαῖοι συγγραφεῖς*,[38] represents the best bet

[35] *FGrHist* 392 F 1; cf. von Fritz, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung* [n. 17], i. 97; F. Jacoby, 'Some Remarks on Ion of Chios', *CQ* 41 (1947), 1–17 (=*Abhandlungen*, 144–68) on Ion's life and *Foundation of Chios*.

[36] Von Fritz, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung* [n. 17], i. 97, ii. 348–77, esp. 348, 369 ff. (Excurs II: Die *Λυδιακά* des Lyders Xanthos).

[37] *FGrHist* 90 F 44. 7 *ἐν δὲ τοῖς βασιλείοις οὐκ ἀναγράφεται*; cf. von Fritz, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung* [n. 17], i. 97.

[38] D.H. *Thuc.* 5. Charon probably wrote during the first half of the 5th cent., though there is considerable discussion about his dating. The dates given by the *Suda*, s.v. *Χάρων* (*FGrHist* 262 T 1), are contradictory, and attempts to emend the text remain unsatisfactory. If he belongs to the first half of the 5th cent., it is difficult to believe that he really wrote those works attributed to him by the *Suda*. This prompted F. Jacoby, 'Charon von Lampsakos', *SIFC*, NS 15 (1938), 207–42, repr. in Jacoby, *Abhandlungen* 178–206, to accept the list of titles while rejecting the ancient chronology, thus sustaining his ideas about the development of historiographical genres. But the ancient tradition is quite unanimous in dating Charon earlier than Herodotus (Plut. *De Herod. mal.* 20, 859 B; Tertullian, *De an.* 46; D.H. *Thuc.* 5). For illuminating comments on the discussoin cf. M. Moggi, 'Autori greci di Persiká, II: Carone di Lampsaco', *ASNP*[3] 7 (1977), 1–26 at 1–7, who cites the previous

in our search for an early annalistic pattern. The *Suda*[39] relates that he wrote *χρονικά* with the title *πρυτάνεις* [*ἢ ἄρχοντες*] *οἱ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων*, of which we know no more than the title. There were never *πρυτάνεις* at Sparta, but Jacoby thought that the term denoted both the Spartan kings and ephors, and that the *ἄρχοντες* probably derive from a gloss.[40] Perhaps Charon tried to revise the genealogical tradition of the Spartan kings into a chronicle, but this cannot be proved.[41] Fowler reminds us of an attempt, once opposed by Jacoby, to emend to *πρυτάνεις τῶν Λαμψακηνῶν*, which raises the question whether this is not simply another title for *Ὧροι Λαμψακηνῶν*.[42] Charon's *Ὧροι Λαμψακηνῶν* have come down to us in two fragments, and other untitled fragments may belong to this work. However, none displays an annalistic pattern.[43] If we follow Dionysius' dating and take Charon to be older than Herodotus and Hellanicus, there might have been an attempt to list kings or officials before Hellanicus, but we cannot prove the use of an annalistic pattern.

This leaves us to consider another potential root: genealogies. Hellanicus started work as a genealogist. In antiquity he was most famous for his mythographical and genealogical work: in the *Deukalioneia*, *Phoronis*, *Asopis*, and *Atlantis* he reduced the mass of mythological tales and genealogies to just four ancestors. He managed to tell the stories of those four 'lineages' in a parallel and synchronistic way, leading to the generation of the Trojan war, which he described in the *Troika*. He knew how to lengthen and shorten genealogies, how to construct synchronisms, and where to find the information. His system became the accepted one and the starting-point for later constructions.

literature. More recently, Fowler, 'Herodotus and his Contemporaries' [n. 5], 67, also follows the ancient tradition regarding Charon's date.

[39] *Suda*, s.v. *Χάρων* (*FGrHist* 262 T 1).

[40] *FGrHist* IIIa. 3–4; cf. Mosshammer, *The* Chronicle *of Eusebius* [n. 3], 89–90 with n. 9.

[41] W. Den Boer, *Laconian Studies* (Amsterdam, 1954), 35, believes that Charon attempted to link the genealogical chronology based on the Spartan kings to an 'annalistic list', but must have failed, since his work was not preserved. Mosshammer, *The* Chronicle *of Eusebius* [n. 3], 90, thinks that the revision required to make the king-lists fit for historical chronology might perhaps have appeared in Charon's *Prytaneis*.

[42] Fowler, 'Herodotos and his Contemporaries' [n. 5], 67 with n. 44.

[43] Jacoby, *FGrHist* IIIa. 5, wishes to imply an annalistic pattern in comparing Charon 262 F 1 with Hdt. 3. 59. 4 and suggesting that ⟨*ἐπὶ τοῦ δεῖνα* **⟩ might have been left out in the beginning.

But can we assume that Hellanicus' experience in genealogical writing helped him to shape an annalistic pattern? First of all, he dealt primarily with mythical genealogies, which are autonomous in being unconnected to measured time. Measuring the past was in no way their purpose. After all, the genealogists only gradually began to have a notion of quantifying past time. Their main purpose was always to explain relationships between people, cities, or concepts. The necessity to fix the representatives of different generations in time arose only when historiography had discovered the need for a chronological pattern and presumably tried to use genealogies in that way. Then complete genealogies (those very rare genealogies linking the mythical forefathers to a contemporary descendant in an unbroken line) became more important, facilitating the fixing of generations in time.

The idea of shaping historiographical writing according to an annalistic pattern cannot have arisen directly from genealogical writing, since genealogies only give rough generations, and not the precise year in which something happened. This justifies Mosshammer's reservations against the view that chronography developed from genealogy.[44] He views generational chronology as essentially a device for imposing a structure on the available evidence, though it cannot provide a reasonably exact arithmetical basis. What is more, the difference between a genealogy and a literary work written on the annalistic model is, of course, that the latter does not tell the story of one family, but divides the events from the names and puts them together separately, allowing the possibility of adding more events.[45] It was quite common for genealogies to be turned into lists and vice versa, but this is an important step: the genealogical tree has to be stripped of its branches and the related stories. Only such an abstract form could be turned into a suitable device for the annalistic pattern.

Cross-cultural comparison tells us that it is quite easy to transform genealogies into king-lists and vice versa. In literate societies, both forms were applied and mutually converted according

[44] Mosshammer, *The* Chronicle *of Eusebius* [n. 3], 101–5.

[45] Jacoby, 'Hellanikos' [n. 19], 120, maintained that already in Hellanicus' *Troika* the genealogy only supported the listing of events, and therefore that in his other genealogical works Hellanicus' main interest had been in sorting out the genealogies themselves. In *FGrHist* 1a. 440 Jacoby pointed out that we no longer have the shape of a stemma but a narrative (FF 28, 31).

to demand. Henige[46] understands the Jodhpur chronicles as an ascending genealogy representing a converted king-list. A privileged Indian family of the sixteenth century AD tried to support their position at court with an illustrious stemma. In pursuing this aim, they manipulated the chronicles by turning the king-list into an ascending genealogy, incorporating a medieval dynasty into their own stemma.

The Spartan 'king-lists' represent the opposite phenomenon: an ascending genealogy converted into a king-list.[47] At Herodotus 7. 204 and 8. 131 the so-called Spartan king-lists are given as ascending lines of sons, fathers, and forefathers without branches, which is unusual in Herodotus' work, since genealogical information is normally only found in scattered form throughout the text. Of course, Parker is quite right to be suspicious of such an extended father–son succession,[48] but it is not necessary for that reason to take them to be proper king-lists, only secondarily representing genealogies. It is much more likely that Herodotus meant them to be the genealogies of the two Spartan kings Leonidas and Leotychidas, legitimizing their descent from Heracles, especially as he emphasizes the fact that the two named before Leotychidas were not kings at all. As Cartledge points out, all later writers assumed that Herodotus wrote king-lists,[49] but it does not follow that he actually intended to (re)produce such lists. I assume rather that,

[46] D. P. Henige, *The Chronology of Oral Tradition* (Oxford, 1974), 201–6 (appendix B).

[47] Cf. ibid. 207–13 (appendix C). However, Henige holds that Herodotus' genealogies were not, and were probably never intended to be, king-lists. See also ibid., 23 ff. for the 'grid effect', causing further manipulation. D. W. Prakken, 'Herodotus and the Spartan King Lists', *TAPhA* 71 (1940), 460–72, maintained that the king-lists, originally recorded by Hecataeus, were used by Herodotus in slightly altered form to establish the genealogical relationship of Leonidas and Leotychidas with Heracles. That Hecataeus first recorded the Spartan king-lists was maintained by E. Meyer, *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte*, i (Halle, 1892), 153–88, esp. 170. W. Burkert, 'Lydia between East and West or How to Date the Trojan War: A Study in Herodotus', in J. B. Carter and S. P. Morris (eds.), *The Ages of Homer: A Tribute to Emily T. Vermeule* (Austin, Tex., 1995), 139–48 at 143–4, has since successfully refuted Meyer's argument.

[48] V. Parker, 'Some Dates in Early Spartan History', *Klio*, 75 (1993), 45–60 at 57 ff. But he turns this into an argument against D. Fehling, *Die sieben Weisen und die frühgriechische Chronologie* (Bern, 1985), 129, who declared that the Spartan king-lists were fakes, and Herodotus their probable author. Cf. Henige, *The Chronology of Oral Tradition* [n. 46], 71 ff., on the extended father–son succession in general; and P. Cartledge, *Sparta and Lakonia* (London, 1979), 345, on breaks in the lineal succession after 491 BC.

[49] Cartledge, *Sparta and Lakonia* [n. 48], 341–6 (appendix 3), follows the ancient

since Herodotus wrote these genealogies in the form of lists, they were soon taken for king-lists.

In Herodotus, where we encounter them for the first time, the lists lack any direct connection to chronological calculations, and only support the claim for kingship and excellence. It must be open to question whether we can ascribe a first revision of the Spartan king-lists to Charon of Lampsacus, but it was said of Timaeus at any rate that he used the Spartan kings for his synchronisms (Pol. 12. 11. 1). And we know that for Eratosthenes and Apollodorus the succession of Spartan kings was fundamental to their computations (Plut. *Lyc*. 1. 3; D.S. 1. 5. 1).

It has not proved possible to find a Greek paradigm for use of an annalistic pattern, nor does there seem to be much connection between genealogical and annalistic methods of organizing the past in Greece. This may prompt us to look for influences from the east.[50] The most likely model, the Near Eastern chronicle,[51] plainly differed from the idea of historiographical writing as understood in the Greek tradition, but it contained reports of kingly deeds, organized on an annual pattern. A direct adoption of the chronicle from the east, however, does not seem very probable, since the idea of writing a chronicle organized by reference to rulers would certainly have had to be adjusted to Greek reality, where there were neither many kings nor records linking annual office-holders with events. Instead, we might borrow the 'documentary model' introduced by O. Murray.[52]

tradition, in which it was taken for granted that Herodotus had both written king-lists and intended them as such (342).

[50] Von Fritz, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung* [n. 17], i. 491, already asserted that Hellanicus was trying in his *Hiereiai* to create a chronological instrument analogous to the system of regnal years in the Near East.

[51] Cf. J. Renger, 'Vergangenes Geschehen in der Textüberlieferung des alten Mesopotamien', in H.-J. Gehrke and A. Möller (eds.), *Vergangenheit und Lebenswelt: Soziale Komunikation, Traditionsbildung und historisches Bewußtsein* (Tübingen, 1996), 9–60 at 13–14, for kinds of Near Eastern chronographical texts; D. B. Redford, *Pharaonic King-lists, Annals and Day-books* (Mississagua, 1986), for Egyptian annals.

[52] O. Murray, 'Herodotus and Oral History', in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg and A. Kuhrt (eds.), *Achaemenid History*, ii. *The Greek Sources* (Leiden, 1987), 93–115 at 109–10, repr. in this volume (pp. 16–44 at 37), developed a concept of a 'documentary model' and took it to explain passages in Herodotus which are likely to rest on the Greek element in the Persian imperial bureaucracy. 'Belonging to at least the fringes of a highly specialised literate culture, their organisation [sc. that of the Greek members of the Persian imperial bureaucracy] of material would naturally

In the absence of suitable documents in Greece, the documentary form of the chronicle had to be conceived on an annalistic model, shaping a year-by-year structure from an utterly different kind of evidence. This meant admitting the scribal tradition of the chronicle to the oral tradition in which Greek historiography was born. In any event, it would appear that the result of the research was expressed in a literary manner rather than in a dry recitation of eponymous names and events, given the evidence available to early Greek chroniclers. Scholars in Greek historiography frequently assume, however, that the writing of literary chronicles required written documents such as lists of kings or eponymous officials, to which events were related.[53] However, this kind of document was probably only generated by the adoption of the annalistic pattern. If we use the concept of a 'documentary model', we may avoid the search for real documentary evidence.

If we are right to assume a 'documentary model' for Hellanicus' idea of writing a universal history on an annalistic pattern, it is not surprising that he should first have turned to priests, in his case the Argive priestesses of Hera, as he would only rarely have been able to rely on the reigns of kings in Greece. Whereas eponymous officials change annually, both priestesses and kings had reigns of a number of years. It was only later in his *Atthis* that he used the reigns of the Athenian kings and the annual archons to structure a local history of Athens.[54]

3. *Hellanicus'* Hiereiai

Why, of all possibilities, did Hellanicus use the ἱέρειαι at Argos as a chronological backbone for his attempt to write 'universal his-

follow the scribal mental forms of the table and the list: asked for information, they would reply, not with a *logos*, but with an ordered "documentary form".' This does not mean that there was necessarily a real document behind such passages in Herodotus, but that the historian accepted scribal practice and the scribal mentality. For Greeks at the Persian court cf. D. M. Lewis, *Sparta and Persia* (Leiden, 1977), 13 ff., further developed with references to the 'documentary' material in Herodotus in 'Persians in Herodotus', in *The Greek Historians: Literature and History. Papers Presented to A. E. Raubitschek* (Stanford, 1985), 101–17 at 108, repr. in id., *Selected Papers in Greek and Near Eastern History* (Cambridge, 1997), 345–61 at 351.

[53] Cf. R. Laqueur, 'Lokalchronik', *RE* xiii (1926), 1083–110 at 1083.

[54] C. Joyce, 'Was Hellanicus the First Chronicler of Athens?', *Histos*, 1999 (http://www.dur.ac.uk/Classics/histos/1999/Joyce.html), challenges this assumption, though not always with convincing arguments.

tory'? Ambaglio[55] suggests three hypothetical answers, which are not mutually exclusive:

(1) The most obvious seems to be that Hellanicus was at Argos when he wrote the outline of this work. Here he may have had the document in the form of a list both readily available[56] and providing the most secure dating for the pre-classical period. This assumption presupposes that Hellanicus could have found a list deposited in the temple archive. This is less likely than the assumption that he had different epichoric traditions and genealogies to hand.[57]

(2) Perhaps Hellanicus wanted to stress the sacred primacy of the priestesses of Hera at Argos. But this is not easy to substantiate. Ambaglio's reference to the story of Cleobis and Biton at Herodotus 1. 31 at least offers no support for the view that the Argive sanctuary of Hera had greater prestige than other sanctuaries. Perhaps Thucydides' treatment of the burning of the temple of Hera in the summer of 423 BC (4. 133), in a passage where he covers several disparate items at the end of the year, could be an indication of the sanctuary's reputation outside Argos. Normally he does not give much information not directly related to the war. If, on the other hand, this information was taken from Hellanicus' *Hiereiai*, we may be justified in assuming a merely literary influence.

(3) One should not exclude political reasons behind Hellanicus' choice. Argos was neutral after Plataea at the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war (Thuc. 2. 9), but was drawn into alliances with Athens, Elis, and Mantinea after 421. Following the defeat of Mantinea, Argos became dependent on Sparta, which supported the oligarchic revolt of 417 (Thuc. 5. 81). This event might have driven Hellanicus to Athens, if indeed he was at Argos. Since there are indications that Hellanicus published his *Hiereiai* around 423–421 BC,[58] the idea of using the Argive priestesses of Hera might indeed have been influenced by Argos' political neutrality.

[55] Ambaglio, 'L'opera storiografica di Ellanico di Lesbo' [n. 23], 40–1.

[56] Cf. B. Niese, 'Die Chroniken des Hellanicus', *Hermes*, 23 (1888), 81–91 at 90; M. Wörrle, *Untersuchungen zur Verfassungsgeschichte von Argos im 5. Jh. v. Chr.* (diss. Erlangen-Nürnberg, 1964), 84; Pearson, *The Early Ionian Historians* [n. 25], 227.

[57] Cf. Toye 'Dionysius of Halicarnassus on the First Greek Historians' [n. 30], 296.

[58] Cf. Jacoby, 'Hellanikos' [n. 19], 148.

However, the most important consideration, already pointed out by Jacoby,[59] seems to be that Hellanicus chose the one sequence of office-holders that reached back far enough. The Spartan 'king-list' began only with the return of the Heraclids, and the Athenian king-list, though later constructed by Hellanicus as beginning with Cecrops, eight or nine generations before the Trojan war,[60] changed when the annual archons were elected. Nor could he use one which ended abruptly, like the Argive king-list, although it began in very early times. The list of Olympian victors, if Hellanicus had thought of establishing it, would have been far too short for dating events prior to the Trojan war.

Hellanicus needed a sequence extending over the whole period of history he wanted to cover. The Argive priestesses of Hera held office during Hellanicus' lifetime, and had done so almost since the time of Phoroneus, the first man.[61] We do not even need to argue that he used the Argive priestesses of Hera because he found the list in the temple archive at Argos. The material he found, consisting of old genealogy and oral tradition, appears to have reached back far enough for his purposes, and he may have included some of it already in his *Argolika*.[62]

Hellanicus was already an experienced genealogist when he started his new task. He had written a *Phoronis* and surely knew the earlier literature: the epic *Phoronis*, the pseudo-Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, Acusilaus' Argive genealogies.[63] In these he found the woman who was said to have been the first priestess of Hera. It is not easy to tell which version of Argive genealogy he used, since the matter was hotly debated owing to quarrels between Argos and Tiryns in particular about the sanctuary of Hera.[64] Kallithoe, or Kallithya, mentioned by the oldest source, the epic *Phoronis*

[59] Ibid. 146.

[60] Cf. ibid. 139–40.

[61] Von Fritz, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung* [n. 17], i. 481, considered it doubtful whether Hellanicus followed Acusilaus in making Phoroneus the progenitor of humankind.

[62] Unfortunately, only two fragments survive (F 36a–b), in which we learn about the distribution of land among the sons of Phoroneus.

[63] *Phoronis*, ed. M. Davies, *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Göttingen, 1988); cf. G. L. Huxley, *Greek Epic Poetry from Eumelos to Panyassis* (London, 1969), 31 ff.; pseudo-Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, ed. R. Merkelbach and M. L. West (Oxford, 1969); Acusilaus of Argos, *FGrHist* 2; cf. von Fritz, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung* [n. 17], i. 481.

[64] Cf. J. M. Hall, 'How Argive was the "Argive" Heraion? The Political and Cultic Geography of the Argive Plain, 900–400 BC', *AJA* 99 (1995), 577–613. His argument (609–10), however, runs a little differently from mine, leaving out Kallithoe, and

of the sixth, perhaps seventh century BC, as the first priestess of Hera,[65] stands in the Tirynthian tradition, whereas Io is named in the Argive version. Jacoby argued that the pseudo-Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* made the connection between Io and Kallithya which enabled the Argive historians—we know that Acusilaus connected Phoroneus and his descendants with Argos—to annex the Tirynthian cult of Hera, and to subordinate the Tirynthian tradition to that of Argos. After this process had taken place, it was possible to redefine 'Io Kallithyessa' as referring to two separate priestesses. It was perhaps Hellanicus who found Io occupying the sixth position according to Argive genealogies, and was happy to discover an old tradition for the very first priestess of Hera, Kallithya.[66]

Of course, Hellanicus could not rely on a single genealogy in the case of the *Hiereiai*; he had to rely on diverse traditions about the names, and perhaps the sequence, of priestesses in order to organize the events. Besides the written tradition, which was probably scattered, there must have been oral traditions at Argos about the priestesses of Hera since the time of Kallithya and Io. Since it appears that each of the priestesses must have served for a considerable period, there cannot have been a particularly large number of priestesses in total, and it is not difficult to imagine that their names were well remembered. Perhaps the custom related by Pausanias, of erecting a statue for each in front of the temple, helped to keep their memory alive, although we cannot say when the practice started.[67]

Jacoby[68] pointed out that Hellanicus was not taking over a custom from everyday life. The *hiereiai* cannot be called eponymous,[69] and besides the fact that the office was for life, for dating purposes they exist only in literature. Furthermore, we never find them in

arguing that Io was wrenched from her Tirynthian ancestry and given an Argive father.

[65] *Phoronis* fr. 3 Davies.

[66] F. Jacoby, ''*Ἰὼ Καλλιθύεσσα*', *Hermes*, 57 (1922), 366–74 (=*Abhandlungen*, 334–41).

[67] Paus. 2. 17. 3; cf. 17. 7. We can see the usefulness of counting statues from the story Herodotus tells us (2. 143) about Hecataeus' experience in Egypt, when he was shown the statues of 345 Egyptian priests (cf. A. B. Lloyd, *Herodotus, Book II: Commentary 99–182* (Leiden, 1988), 107 ff.).

[68] Jacoby, 'Hellanikos' [n. 19], 148.

[69] Cf. Niese, 'Die Chroniken des Hellanikos' [n. 56], 89 ff.

connection with local Argive history, and where they appear in literature, we may assume Hellanicus' influence.[70] On the other hand, we do not know much about Argive epichoric dating. During the first half of the sixth century BC the names of nine *δαμιοργοί* who 'held the power' (*ἐϝανάσσαντο*) were inscribed on a stone, presumably a doorpost, found on the acropolis, the Larisa, but they made up a body of nine officials rather than holding office during nine successive years. On the motives for the inscription we can only speculate.[71] At the end of the second century BC we find *ἱερομνάμονες* of Hera on two manumission documents, apparently eponymous officials at this time.[72] The literature of local history at Argos appears relatively rich, but its poor and fragmentary condition prevents us from understanding whether epichoric dates were used, as assumed by Jacoby for the fourth century,[73] and whether indeed the Argive kings were used for the early history before the fifth century.[74]

The influence of Hellanicus' *Hiereiai* can be seen in the *ἀναγραφή* of Sicyon of around 400 BC,[75] which may have been the earliest

[70] Niese, ibid. 90, believed that there had been a system of dating by priestesses of Hera before Hellanicus and not only at Argos. This assumption was already challenged by Jacoby, 'Hellanikos' [n. 19], 147–8; cf. Jacoby, *FGrHist* IIIb suppl., 4 n. 41.

[71] *IG* iv. 714 = *SEG* xi. 363; L. H. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece*, 2nd edn., rev. A. W. Johnston (Oxford, 1990), 60, 156–8, pl. 26 no. 7 (dated *c.*575–550). R. K. Sherk, 'The Eponymous Officials of Greek Cities, I', *ZPE* 83 (1990), 249–88 at 265, holds that they were a body of nine, but that they were not necessarily eponymous.

[72] *JÖAI* 14 (1911), suppl. 143 ff., and *IG* iv. 530. 1 ff.; cf. W. Vollgraff, 'Inscriptions d'Argos', *BCH* 33 (1909), 171–200 at 183–4, for an improved reading; cf. Wörrle, *Untersuchungen zur Verfassungsgeschichte von Argos* [n. 56], 19 n. 40, 84–5 n. 30. Sherk, 'The Eponymous Officials of Greek Cities, I' [n. 71], 266, also mentions a pair of secretaries (*γροφεῖς*) as eponymous in the hellenistic age.

[73] *FGrHist* 304–14 with commentary *FGrHist* IIIb. 11–15, here 12–13. with n. 18.

[74] Wörrle, *Untersuchungen zur Verfassungsgeschichte von Argos* [n. 56], 83 n. 25, knows only one example where an Argive *βασιλεύς* is mentioned in an inscription (cf. W. Vollgraff, 'Inscription d'Argos', *BCH* 34 (1910), 331–54; id., 'Inscription d'Argos', *BCH* 37 (1913), 279–308 pl. 4; Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece* [n. 71], 170 no. 39a–b; ML 42 B. 43) but argues against the view that the kings were abolished in the second half of the 5th cent. We can only tell that the *βασιλεύς* was no longer of any political importance, since he is not mentioned as one of the officials swearing the oath in 420 BC (Thuc. 5. 47. 9).

[75] *FGrHist* 550 FF 1 (Heraclides Ponticus fr. 83a Voss = 157 Wehrli ap. Plut. *Mor. de mus.* 1131 F–1132 A) and 2 (Heraclides Ponticus fr. 83h Voss ap. Plut. *Mor. de mus.* 1134 B). Jacoby, *FGrHist* 131 IIB. 443, described it as a chronicle of the

example of a literary work inscribed on stone. However, the stone is not extant, the *ἀναγραφή* being referred to only in Plutarch's treatise on music. Plutarch (*Mor.* 1132 A) informs us that Heraclides found here the names of the priestesses at Argos, the composers, and the musicians. It was very likely no local chronicle of Sicyon which might have used the Sicyonian kings,[76] but a history of 'old' music organized by reference to the priestesses of Hera at Argos. The identification of the author with Menaechmus of Sicyon is unconvincing, since the *ἀναγραφή* is probably older, and indeed Menaechmus seems to have made use of it.[77] Timaeus, in order to establish various synchronisms, compared the priestesses of Hera at Argos with the kings and ephors of Sparta, the Athenian archons, and the Olympic victors (ap. Pol. 12. 11. 1). The *κτίσις* of Magnesia on the Maeander achieved the impression of greater antiquity by mentioning a priestess of Hera,[78] but we certainly cannot claim that this date was found in Hellanicus' *Hiereiai*. Jacoby listed altogether twelve names of priestesses of Hera at Argos, all of whom he maintained were originally found in Hellanicus' *Hiereiai*.[79]

Hellanicus' chronographical achievement concerning his *Hiereiai*, and even more so his *Atthis*, met with less than universal approval; Thucydides explicitly and implicitly rejected it.[80] In 1. 97

Sicyonian Pythiai going back to earliest times. Cf. Kleingünther, *Πρῶτος εὑρετής* [n. 24], 138–9.

[76] Cf. Jacoby, *Atthis*, 357 n. 24.

[77] Against the identification of the author with Menaechmus by H. Diels, 'Die Olympionikenliste aus Oxyrhynchos', *Hermes*, 36 (1901), 70–80 at 76 n. 1, and F. Pfister, 'Die Lokalhistorie von Sikyon bei Menaichmos, Pausanias und den Chronographen', *RhM* 68 (1913), 529–37 at 535–6, see *FGrHist* IIB. 443, and A. Chaniotis, *Historie und Historiker in den griechischen Inschriften* (Stuttgart, 1988), 90.

[78] *IvM* 17; *FGrHist* 482 Anhang (XLVIII Magnesia) F 3. 18; cf. F. Prinz, *Gründungsmythen und Sagenchronologie* (Munich, 1979), 130 ff., 403–4, Text 93. 13–14; Chaniotis, *Historie und Historiker* [n. 77], 37–8.

[79] Jacoby, 'Hellanikos' [n. 19], 144; *FGrHist* IA. 455; cf. W. McLeod, 'New Readings in I.G., XIV, 1285, II, Verso', *Hesperia*, 42 (1973), 408–15.

[80] Thus, the assumption of the anonymous author of P. Oxy. 853 (cf. Pritchett, *Dionysius of Halicarnassus:* On Thucydides [n. 29], 147, who quotes the translation of Grenfell and Hunt in *P. Oxy.* vi), that the system of dating by archons and Olympiads had not yet come into common use, seems to be a little distorted. He is probably right, however, that Thucydides did not know any system of using the Olympionikai as the basis for chronological reference, although Thucydides did explicitly criticize calculation by archons and other officials. Thucydides' allusions to two victors in the pankration (3. 8; 5. 49), however, have to be explained in their context. In both cases Thucydides is relating events happening at Olympia during

Thucydides is explicit in his criticism of Hellanicus. He justifies his own treatment of the Pentekontaetia by stating that before him historians had only treated the Persian war or the time before, and that the only writer to have touched on the time after the Persian war was Hellanicus in his *Ἀττικὴ ξυγγραφή*, which he criticizes as 'very brief and inaccurate in chronology [*βραχέως τε καὶ τοῖς χρόνοις οὐκ ἀκριβῶς*].[81] This critique apparently refers to Hellanicus' method of dating by archons, since in 5. 20 Thucydides calls the method of calculating by officials inaccurate (*οὐ γὰρ ἀκριβές ἐστιν*).[82] Here we have an explicit reference to the then current chronogaphical method of dating past events by eponymous officials. However, we can be fairly certain that Thucydides' main target of criticism was Hellanicus, although he addresses an anonymous plural. Thucydides wrote:

People should calculate the actual periods of time; they should not rely on lists of archons or other officials[83] whose names may be used in different cities to mark the dates of the past events. For such methods of calculations

an Olympic year, and the mention of the victor identifies the Olympiad rather than functioning as a kind of abstract dating device.

[81] Against the assumption that the sentence criticizing Hellanicus was added *a posteriori* by Thucydides himself, see R. G. Lenardon, 'Thucydides and Hellanicus', in *Classical Contributions: Studies in Honor of Malcolm F. McGregor* (Locust Valley, NY, 1981), 59–70, esp. 61, and J. D. Smart, 'Thucydides and Hellanicus', in I. S. Moxon, J. D. Smart, and A. J. Woodman (eds.), *Past Perspectives: Studies in Greek and Roman Historical Writing* (Cambridge, 1986), 19–35, esp. 29–30 with n. 44 for further bibliography, who believe that the whole excursus on the Pentekontaetia was written in response to Hellanicus' *Atthis* (against e.g. G. E. M. de Ste Croix, *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War* (London, 1972), 314–15).

[82] Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Aristoteles und Athen* [n. 11], i. 284, and A. Andrewes, in A. W. Gomme, A. Andrewes, and K. J. Dover, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, v (Oxford, 1981), 381, assumed that Thucydides considered Hellanicus' chronology of the recent past to be inaccurate, while Jacoby, *Atthis*, 397 n. 49, and *FGrHist* IIIb suppl., 16–17, and Niese, 'Die Chroniken des Hellanikos' [n. 56], 81–2, held that he criticized the whole system of dating by archons.

[83] Another possible translation would be: 'they should not rely on enumerating [*ἀπαρίθμησιν*] names of archons or other officials', which would avoid the emphasis on lists. However, this passage has been the subject of massive textual emendations and attempted translations; cf. O. Lendle, 'Zu Thucydides 5, 20, 2', *Hermes*, 88 (1960), 33–40; G. S. Shrimpton, 'Time, Memory, and Narrative in Thucydides', *Storia della storiografia*, 28 (1995), 47–54 at 48. Shrimpton, 51, gives a highly original translation. He maintains that this passage makes sense on the assumption that the historian was designing a 'chronological' system that would make his account of the war easy to retain in the memory and recall piecemeal.

are inaccurate in that they leave it unclear whether an event occurred in the beginning, the middle or at some other point, of a magistrate's term of office. (5. 20, trans. Hornblower)[84]

And, as is well known, Thucydides (5. 26) went on to propose his method of counting by summers and winters as more suitable to his aim of writing contemporary history, which necessarily had to deal with many more events and needed a more detailed structure, i.e. more subdivisions in the passage of time.

Despite his remarks at the end of the previous chapter, Thucydides dates the beginning of 'his' war, the Peloponnesian war, as follows: 'My history has been set out by summers and winters' (2. 1). He starts the next chapter (2. 2. 1) by saying that the thirty-year peace set up after the sack of Euboea lasted fourteen years, and then describes the Theban raid of Plataea: 'In the fifteenth year, when Chrysis was priestess at Argos in her forty-eighth year, Aenesius was ephor in Sparta, Pythodorus had only two months of his office as archon at Athens left, ten months after the battle of Potidaea.' Hornblower sees this as a rather pompous way to date the event, and interprets Thucydides as essentially intending to mock by giving it in so cumbersome a fashion.[85] But on the other hand, how could Thucydides have fixed the beginning of the war without relating it to other current chronographical devices? And in giving the exact month of Pythodorus' archonship, he seems to have made the attempt to avoid what he criticized before: that one cannot tell if an event happened in the beginning, the middle, or at some other point of a magistrate's office (5. 20. 2).

It can be seen that the temporal structure of historical narratives was an object of fierce discussion at the end of the fifth century BC. By then, alongside 'great historiography' there existed a different type of historiographical writing which used an annalistic pattern. Both types need a chronological framework, but while the former recounts its content in a temporal sequence adjusted to the interests of the author, the chronicle is dominated by the year-by-year structure.[86] This annalistic pattern was probably derived from the

[84] S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides*, ii (Oxford, 1996), 492.

[85] S. Hornblower, 'The Story of Greek Historiography', in id. (ed.), *Greek Historiography* (Oxford, 1994), 7–54 at 25–6.

[86] Of course, we have to consider the difference in content. 'Great historiography'

oriental documentary model, not built on readily available documentary evidence. Names could have been taken from genealogies and from other traditions, whether oral, literary, or epigraphical. In any case, the first chronographers (like the other early historians) had to work out the sequence of names and events, and could not merely rely on annotated lists. Hellanicus built his chronographical work on genealogical, historiographical, and oral tradition, shaping the whole narrative on the oriental documentary model of the chronicle.

chose contemporary events, while chronicles mainly dealt with 'ancient history'. There might also have been a difference in purpose, as pointed out for antiquarian studies by A. Momigliano, 'Ancient History and the Antiquarian', in id., *Studies in Historiography* (London, 1966), 1–39 at 4: Thucydides intended to be useful to the politician while Hippias, Hellanicus, Damastes, and Charon took pleasure in erudition for its own sake. However, chronography as distinguished from horography cannot be taken as representing pure pleasure in erudition, since its intention is to serve chronology on a universal scale.

13

Thucydides' Archaeology: Between Epic and Oral Traditions

ROBERTO NICOLAI

THE Archaeology in book 1 is the only place in Thucydides' work where the history of Greece from the origins to the Persian wars is dealt with in a less than sporadic way. The present contribution will not attempt a comprehensive scrutiny of all the many problems raised by the Archaeology. It will rather suggest an interpretation of this text which helps to understand its function within the framework of Thucydides' work. In the Archaeology Thucydides deals once and for all with ancient history, with those who have preserved its memory, and with the methods by which it can be investigated and narrated. Accordingly, our starting-point will be the structure of the Archaeology, and I shall propose a rhetorical analysis in terms of demonstrative rhetoric (Section 1). However, in the Archaeology Thucydides does not merely aim at arguing for the superiority of the Peloponnesian war to all main conflicts of the past. His insistence (Section 2) on the relative value of the sources of information—epic poets, logographers, monuments, oral traditions—and on the methods of enquiry—ethnographic comparison, arguments based on verisimilitude—show that in the Archaeology Thucydides also wants to affirm strongly the superior exemplary value of his enquiry into the history of the most recent period (Section 3). At the core of Thucydides' argument are the oral traditions: on the one hand they share problems with information elicited from eyewitnesses, and on the other, as far as their credibility is concerned, they come closer to the tales of poets and logographers (Section 4). Investigating Thucydides' attitudes towards oral tradition also allows us to shed some light on his own perception of his work as a historian and

of the boundaries between his work and contiguous genres, namely epic poetry and Herodotean historiography.

1. *An Attempt at Rhetorical Analysis*

To analyse Thucydides' proem by dividing it into its parts, as if it were an oration, is certainly a somewhat strained approach. But this procedure may be justified both by referring to the ancient practice of superimposing rhetorical categories on all literary genres and, as we shall see, by referring to the structure of the Archaeology itself.[1]

After defining his subject-matter, Thucydides proceeds immediately to clarify the motives that brought him to select it. Paragraph 1. 1. 3, within a series of causal arguments, is a clear *propositio* which concludes the real *exordium*—the *exordium* of the Archaeology and of the whole work, of course. The core of the Archaeology is structurally a sequence of exempla, following the usage of epideictic discourse (cf., for example, the epitaphs). But in contrast to what happens in epideictic discourse the exempla are connected together not only by function (for instance, to show Athens' greatness or, as in this case, the superiority of the present war), but

[1] The rhetorical analysis of the Archaeology already has a long tradition. E. Täubler, *Die Archäologie des Thukydides* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1927), regards the Archaeology as a single, large demonstration constructed on the plan of a judicial address, incorporated in a historical proem. E. Schwartz, *Das Geschichtswerk des Thukydides*, 2nd edn. (Bonn, 1929), 170, insists on the use of argumentative rhetorical procedures and considers the Archaeology as an *αὔξησις* (cf. D.H. *Thuc.* 19, who severely criticizes both the insertion of the Archaeology, because it is contrary to the precepts of rhetoric, and also the exaggerated praise of the subject-matter of the work). The hint of an attempt at rhetorical analysis is to be found also in F. Bizer, *Untersuchungen zur Archäologie des Thukydides* (diss. Tübingen, 1937), 6, on the praise of the topic in the *exordia*, and in K. von Fritz, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung* (2 vols.; Berlin, 1967), i. 576: the purpose of the Archaeology would be to show the great importance of the subject under discussion, and this would lead to a reconstruction of general conditions rather than of details. On Thucydides' argumentative technique see A. J. Woodman, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography* (London and Sydney, 1988), 5 ff. An attempt at rhetorical analysis of Herodotus' proem is proposed by H. Pelliccia, 'Sappho 16, Gorgia's *Helen*, and the Preface to Herodotus' *Histories*', *YCS* 29 (1992), 63–84, who identifies the technique he calls 'false-start *recusatio*' (64: when an author begins with a story or with a version and starts to develop it but, before finishing, decides for some reason to abandon it in favour of another subject, version, or approach). This technique serves to keep mythology and genealogy at a distance and to declare a preference for military and political history.

also by the chronology and the concatenation of causes. Chapter 21 rounds off the Archaeology with the affirmation that the most ancient facts have been adequately 'found', and this discovery closes the ring opened at the beginning: the Peloponnesian war is the most important of all wars fought up to that time. The chapter has the function of the *recapitulatio* in the oration. It is noteworthy that the methodological discussion on the reliability of the oral traditions and the need to verify them (1. 20) is embedded in the great ring which comprises the entire Archaeology. Chapters 20 and 21 must therefore be considered in strict connection with the whole Archaeology: the reconstruction of the distant past cannot be separated from the method by which it has been carried out. The confutation of poets and *λογογράφοι* serves to prepare the way for Thucydides' proud definition of his own way of working on contemporary history (1. 22).[2]

What, then, really differentiates Thucydides' proem from an oration? It is chapter 23, which in its first part seems to conclude the argument concerning the superiority of the present conflict (1–3)[3] and in the second part deals with the theme of the beginning of

[2] The problem of the proem's unity has been treated above all in connection with the phases of the composition of Thucydides' work: there is a summary of this debate up to the 1930s in Bizer, *Untersuchungen zur Archäologie* [n. 1], 43 ff. (where it is claimed that 1. 23. 1–5 belongs to an earlier phase). P. Krafft, 'Zur Archäologie des Thukydides', in P. Krafft and H. J. Tschiedel (eds.), *Concentus Hexachordus: Beiträge zum 10. Symposion der bayerischen Hochschullehrer für Klassische Philologie in Eichstätt (24.–25. Februar 1984)* (Regensburg, 1986), 79–101, collects the more recent contributions. Cf. also N. G. L. Hammond, 'The Arrangement of Thought in the Proem and in Other Parts of Thucydides I', *CQ*, NS 2 (1952), 127–41 at 136, who treats 1. 1–19 as a single unit, and J. R. Ellis, 'The Structure and Argument of Thucydides' Archaeology', *ClAnt* 10 (1991), 344–75, who identifies two elaborate structures, one in concentric rings and the other linear, based on the chronological sequence. Among the most important interpretations, see K. Ziegler, 'Der Ursprung der Exkurse in Thukydides', *RhM* 78 (1929), 112–27 (who considers the Archaeology to be like the torso of a projected history of Greece from its origins), and Jacoby's reply in the review of W. Schadewaldt, *Die Geschichtsschreibung des Thukydides: Ein Versuch* (Berlin, 1929), in *Historische Zeitschrift*, 142 (1930), 324–8, esp. 326–8, repr. in F. Jacoby, *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtsschreibung*, ed. H. Bloch (Leiden, 1956), 239–42, esp. 241–2, where Jacoby underlines the unity of Archaeology and Pentecontaetia and tends to see a development from the *αὔξησις* in 1. 23 to the complex demonstration carried out in the Archaeology. Woodman, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography* [n. 1], 8–9, rightly observes that 1. 20–21. 1 (1. 21. 2 is defined as a bridge passage) cannot be removed from the Archaeology. Chapter 22 is devoted to the definition of Thucydides' own method.

[3] For this Krafft, 'Zur Archäologie des Thukydides' [n. 2], 90: chapter 23 supplements the demonstration of the superiority of the *κίνεσις* (not of the war in a strict sense) with the list of the infinite sufferings.

the war and its causes. I do not know whether Thucydides really did move chapter 23 from its original position after chapter 21 (see Hornblower ad loc.), but the present collocation seems in any case carefully pondered and, looking at book 1 as a whole, the real diegetic part begins with 1. 24, in neat contrast to the preceding part, which therefore comes to have both compactness and a clear introductory function.

From what we have seen we may deduce that the proem had among its models sophistic discourse: for an Athenian of the time of Thucydides to demonstrate the inferiority of the Trojan war and the Persian wars with respect to the Peloponnesian war would not be very much different from demonstrating the innocence of Helen or Palamedes. The evidence may be found in the psychological observation at 1. 21. 2: although people always think that the war in which they are fighting is the greatest of all, as soon as it is over they extol the wars of the past. The profound difference between Thucydides' proem and sophistic discourse lies in the fact that the Archaeology is integrated into a great historiographic—and, in a broad sense, political—project (there are numerous references back to material in the Archaeology in the rest of the work, e.g. the treatment of Corcyra), while the epideictic discourse is self-contained.

An important comparison can be made with the Sicilian Archaeology of book 6. H. R. Rawlings[4] observes that the pattern is the same in both Archaeologies as both set out to define the extent of the war, although the Sicilian Archaeology seems less analytic and limits itself to making Sicily familiar to the Athenians; furthermore, at the end of both Archaeologies Thucydides specifies the real cause of the war (1. 23. 6; 6. 6. 1).[5] Rawlings' interpretation can generally be accepted, though it is necessary to note that the section on Greek colonization (6. 3–5) gives space to a considerable amount of precise information and a number of names, to a much larger extent than is the case in the Archaeology of book 1. This difference results from the chronology of the events and perhaps also from the availability of sources which Thucydides considered reliable. The Sicilian Archaeology also has a ring structure (it opens and closes with reflections on the size of the island and the number of its in-

[4] H. R. Rawlings III, *The Structure of Thucydides' History* (Princeton, 1981), 65–7.

[5] Ibid. 67–70.

habitants: 6. 1. 1; 6. 6. 1) and it is structured chronologically. While the Archaeology of book 1 emphasizes the control of the sea, the Sicilian Archaeology gives a succession of territorial occupations and accounts of the ethnic groups who gradually divided Sicily among themselves, and emphasizes that Sicily is almost a part of the mainland (6. 1. 2). The Sicilian Archaeology is also an open structure because the recapitulative nature of 6. 6. 1 is linked directly to the definition of the real cause of the expedition and to the extensive diplomatic activity that preceded it.

From these first observations it appears that Thucydides, when he ventures into the distant past, uses special formal structures linked to his aim, which is different from that of the rest of the work.[6] This is confirmed by the Pisistratid excursus, to which I shall return.

2. *Thucydides' Evaluation of his Sources of Information*

It emerges from the Archaeology that the possible sources of information are the *ἀκοαί*, Homer and the poets, the *λογογράφοι* mentioned in 1. 21. 1, ethnographic comparisons, and archaeology. Before making a comparative assessment of these sources, however, it is necessary to examine the chronology to which they refer. For the most ancient phase (the age of Minos and before) there are only *ἀκοαί*—we may add, sometimes collected in epic or genealogical works—to which must be added the recollections handed down by memory among the Peloponnesians with reference to the deeds of Pelops (two generations before the Trojan war). Archaeology, i.e. the Carian graves at Delos, is relegated to a completely marginal role: to supply information on ethnic identity. For the Trojan war the only source is Homer, given that the archaeological evidence is not reliable. For the succeeding period we have a few facts stated as certain in the section on naval power (1. 13–14) and some uncertain

[6] The peculiarity of the history of the distant past was clearly perceived: see Plato *Hipp. Maj.* 285 D, where among the subjects of *ἀρχαιολογία* genealogies—both divine and human—and the foundations of cities are named. See A. Momigliano, 'Storiografia greca', *RSI* 87 (1975), 17–46 at 21, repr. in id., *Sesto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico* (Rome, 1980), 33–67 at 39. On the question of method of enquiry—whether, that is, the Archaeologies diverge from the techniques normally used by Thucydides—see below.

suppositions (e.g. the prevalent use of small ships).[7] For the Persian wars the statements—quite concise—are always unqualified.

Now, since the reliability of the *ἀκοαί* is drastically limited by 1. 20, as had happened for archaeology in 1. 10, the most important sources of information are the written sources, although these are criticized for their exaggerations: Homer for the Trojan war, and the *λογογράφοι* (Herodotus, perhaps Hellanicus and some others) for the Persian wars and the period beginning with the end of the eighth century (Aminocles of Corinth).[8] The information on the stability of Sparta, which began at the end of the ninth century, remains isolated, so that an attempt has been made to interpret it as based on a calculation of generations. The increased frequency of information starting from the end of the eighth or the beginning of the seventh century has also been observed in Herodotus: for this I refer the reader to Pietro Vannicelli's contribution to this volume.[9]

It remains to consider the role of ethnographic comparison: an instrument evaluated positively (1. 6. 6) but one which can be applied—and it could not be otherwise—only to the customs of the peoples.

Let us now examine as a verification, in so far as our documentation permits it, the question of where Thucydides could have obtained the information he gives in the Archaeology. Given that our knowledge of the *λογογράφοι* is limited to Herodotus and to some fragments of other authors, and our knowledge of archaic epic is limited to Homer and Hesiod, there are cases in which we can only speculate. We can distinguish a very distant period before the Trojan war; the period of the Trojan war; the succeeding

[7] Cf. J. de Romilly, *Histoire et raison chez Thucydide* (Paris, 1956), 244: there are in the Archaeology some data which are precise and without comment, but they refer to events after the Trojan war. Cf. also 288.

[8] An attempt to detect the contributions of the various written sources of the Archaeology in U. Köhler, 'Über die Archäologie des Thukydides', in *Commentationes Philologae in Honorem Th. Mommseni* (Berlin, 1877), 370–7. That Thucydides remains inside a Herodotean framework is made clear by the absence of references to the first sacred war and by the treatment of the Persian wars: see S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides*, ii (Oxford, 1996), 125, 128.

[9] Vannicelli has demonstrated that Herodotus used both Heracles and the Trojan war as a point of reference. Thucydides seems to prefer as a chronological threshold the Trojan war, perhaps in relation to his argument on the superiority of the present war. Cf. Ellis, 'The Structure and Argument of Thucydides' Archaeology' [n. 2], 372 ff. (for the central position of the Trojan war) and 365 ff. (for the three chronological periods—the present; the period preceding the present; the distant past).

phase up to the time of Cyrus; and finally the period covered by Herodotus and more recent events.

The overview of Greece in the earliest times which is outlined in chapter 2 is completely devoid of facts and even of names. The exceptions are the references to Thessaly, Boeotia, the Peloponnese, and then Athens. But these exceptions are easily explicable. In the first case one might postulate a reduplication, i.e. a repetition of facts attested in more recent times: for instance, the places most involved with the migrations in 1. 2. 3 (Thessaly, Boeotia, and the Peloponnese) are the same as in 1. 12. 3 and they are, by the way, the three areas situated on the main line of penetration into Greece from the north-east. Alternatively, one might consider 1. 2. 3 on the migrations as a sort of anticipation of something which will be explained more precisely later.[10] Concerning Athens, Thucydides was not indifferent to the insistent Athenian propaganda which above all laid stress on themes like autochthony[11] and hospitality, themes which we also find in the epitaph tradition. The importance of this tradition in forming a framework for Athenian history has been pointed out by Rosalind Thomas.[12] Thomas has shown, among other things, that official tradition concentrates on the legendary past and on the Persian wars and the events following them, with the effect of leaving the long intermediate period empty.[13] And although Thucydides understands the gross distortions in the official traditions about the recent past,[14] for the earlier periods he ends up accepting some of the central tenets of Athenian propaganda: autochthony and Athenian hospitality, regarded as the basis of the growth of the city, and the dominant role of Athens in the colonization of Ionia.

The onomastic reasoning developed in chapter 3 is an example of rationalization of some aspects of a myth, for it attempts to place Hellen's story in time. This story appeared already in Hesiod and therefore, certainly, in the genealogists. The part on the Hellenes,

[10] Cf. de Romilly, *Histoire et raison* [n. 7], 290.

[11] On autochthony see V. J. Rosivach, 'Autochthony and the Athenians', *CQ*, NS 37 (1987), 294–306.

[12] R. Thomas, *Oral Tradition and Written Records in Classical Athens* (Cambridge, 1989), 235: in the absence of any form of teaching of history, the framework offered by the epitaphs could have been more useful than we might expect. Cf. N. Loraux, *L'Invention d'Athènes: Histoire de l'oraison funèbre dans la 'cité classique'* (Paris, The Hague, and New York, 1981).

[13] Thomas, *Oral Tradition and Written Records* [n. 12], 236.

[14] Ibid. 237.

as Vannicelli has shown,[15] presupposes the Catalogue of Ships and in particular *Iliad* 2. 681–5. Herodotus (1. 56–7) refers at length to the Pelasgians as the ancient inhabitants of Greece. For Minos the declared source is *ἀκοή*, and the restrictive expression *ὧν . . . ἴσμεν* may be compared with Herodotus (3. 122. 3), who considers Minos not to belong to the human generations.[16] As for the Carians, Thucydides seems to follow a tradition, different from that of Herodotus 1. 171. 3, according to which the Carians were driven out from their abode by the Ionians and Dorians. These two divergencies from Herodotus are important for attempts at assessing Thucydides' attitude. While Herodotus indicates a boundary between divine and human generations and shows, although not systematically, that he has a certain faith in the possibility of reconstructing the most early history of man, Thucydides seems to consider all information about periods preceding his own on the same level, whether it was in the remote past or concerned more recent events. To consider the mythical Minos as the first organizer of maritime supremacy goes explicitly against Herodotus, whose words Thucydides seems to recollect (*πρῶτος τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν*, referring to Polycrates), and perhaps even refers to by stating the origin of the information: *ἀκοῇ*. On the Carians the difference can be explained by supposing that Thucydides saw the elimination of piracy as a presupposition for thalassocracy: it is not a matter of a different tradition but an autonomous elaboration by him. In this section Thucydides' sources are Herodotus and Homer (for the non-negative evaluation of piracy in 1. 5. 2), upon which the usual logical pattern is superimposed (cities without walls, piracy, the necessity of eliminating piracy, etc.) and the ethnographic comparison added (1. 5. 3–4). The information about the luxurious dress of the Athenians and Ionians seems to come from a local tradition that Thucydides must have considered reliable because recent (1. 6. 3: 'only recently gave up' etc.). A confirmation comes from Aristophanes, *Knights* 1331, where Demos, rejuvenated and returned to the glorious times of Marathon (1134), is described by the Sausage-seller as *τεττιγοφόρος, τἀρχαίῳ σχήματι λαμπρός*. Analogous reasoning may be hypothesized for the information about

[15] P. Vannicelli, 'Il nome *Ἕλληνες* in Omero', *RFIC* 117 (1989), 34–48, esp. 37 ff. and 45 ff.

[16] Cf. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides*, ii [n. 8], 125, who regards the Thucydidean passage on Minos as not perfectly comprehensible without reference to the corresponding passage in Herodotus.

the simple dress of the Spartans and about nudity in athletic competitions (for this second reference Thucydides uses an expression similar to the preceding one: 'not very many years ago'). Here too the ethnographic comparison reinforces the argument (1. 6. 5–6). Chapters 7 and 8 seem to be based on a line of reasoning about the safety of the seas, as a result of which cities could be built near the coast and were able to increase their wealth and power. The identification of the Carians derives from archaeological evidence.

The story of Pelops and Atreus is traced back, with a long paraphrase, to Peloponnesian oral tradition (1. 9. 2). The legend was very well known and, together with oral sources, written sources such as Acusilaus of Argos were presumably available. The richness in detail, unusual for the Archaeology, is striking.[17] The discussion of the naval power of Agamemnon (1. 9. 3–4) is instead based on Homer. After some archaeological observations the discussion returns to Homer, the main source for the Trojan war, although criticized and limited in his reliability (1. 10. 3–5). It is noteworthy that Thucydides insists on using Homer, and particularly the Catalogue of Ships (1. 9. 4; 1. 10. 4–5), perhaps arguing implicitly against Herodotus, who makes conspicuously little use of Homer as a source.[18] On the other hand, the insistence on the Catalogue could be explained from its political use—e.g. in the controversies concerning Salamis or Sigeum—which made of it a sort of authority which could be called upon as evidence. The elaboration of 1. 11 on the duration of the war is also based on Homer. The detail of the defensive wall which was constructed by the Achaeans once they

[17] See de Romilly, *Histoire et raison* [n. 7], 257.

[18] For Herodotus see Vannicelli in D. Marcozzi, M. Sinatra, and P. Vannicelli, 'Tra epica e storiografia: Il "catalogo delle navi"', in *Giornata di studio in memoria di Marcello Durante* (Roma, 23 marzo 1994 = *SMEA* 33; 1994), 163–74 at 164–8; for Thucydides, Marcozzi and Sinatra, ibid., esp. 173–4. See also V. Hunter, 'Thucydides and the Uses of the Past', *Klio*, 62 (1980), 191–218 at 198: Thucydides accepts Homer and the Peloponnesian oral tradition as 'partially accurate'; also V. Hunter, *Past and Process in Herodotus and Thucydides* (Princeton, 1982), 30 ff. An overall view which also involves the use of lyric and dramatic poetry in H. Verdin, 'Les remarques critiques d'Hérodote et de Thucydide sur la poésie en tant que source historique', in *Historiographia Antiqua: Commentationes Lovanienses in Honorem W. Peremans Septuagenarii Editae* (Leuven, 1977), 53–76, according to which both Herodotus and Thucydides use poetry as a source, bearing in mind the differences in genres; Thucydides' position is, however, more complex, as in many cases a poetic text is only a starting-point for his own reasoning. Thucydides seems to intend to show, particularly in the Archaeology, how to make good use of poetic texts, especially some particular examples which lend themselves to inductive reasoning—as is the case with the Catalogue of Ships.

arrived at Troy could be derived from an epic source other than Homer, e.g. the Epic Cycle, as well as the oaths sworn to Tyndareus (1. 9. 1) and perhaps the cultivation of the Chersonese (1. 11. 1). The arduous return of the heroes from Troy (1. 12. 3) was the subject-matter of the *Nostoi* and the *Odyssey*. The occupation of Boeotia by the Boeotians from Arne sixty years after the fall of Troy (1. 12. 3) is information that could derive from Homeric exegesis (on *Iliad* 2. 507): Hornblower and Vannicelli hypothesize that Boeotian Arne could be a phantom born of the Catalogue poet's transposition of Thessalian Arne into Boeotia.[19] The chronology could come from speculations of earlier *λογογράφοι*. The same could be said for the dating of the return of the Heraclids to the Peloponnese (1. 12. 3).[20] The concise statement about the colonial expansion (1. 12. 4) covers, as has been noted, the period from the return of the Heraclids to the end of the Dark Age.

Chapters 13 and 14, after touching on the transition from monarchies to tyrannies, deal with the history of Greek naval power. I think that the information about early monarchies derives from speculation about royalty in Homer. For the tyrants Thucydides has local traditions and, of course, Herodotus at his disposal. For the history of naval powers, leaving aside unverifiable hypotheses like Forrest's list of thalassocracies, one must envisage written sources, above all because Thucydides gives a date for the first modern ship and for the first naval battle. It is to be noted that, apart from the mention of Aminocles, Thucydides makes no reference to the tyrants of Corinth (cf. e.g. Hdt. 3. 44 ff.) and limits himself to notice of the importance of the position of the city and its great wealth, as witnessed by the poets (1. 13. 2–5). Thucydides wants to indicate the first known occurrences of facts: the first thalassocracy, the first modern ship,[21] and the earliest naval battle.[22] This serves to pinpoint the archetypes, the decisive points of departure of phenomena which are central to politico-military history—without overlook-

[19] See S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides*, i (Oxford, 1991), ad loc., and P. Vannicelli, 'Problemi della Beozia omerica', in *Atti e memorie del secondo congresso internazionale di micenologia*, ii (Roma–Napoli 14–20 ottobre 1991; Rome, 1996), 939–45 at 941 ff.

[20] For an assessment of the ancient traditions on the Dorian invasion see D. Musti, 'Continuità e discontinuità tra Achei e Dori nelle tradizioni storiche', in id. (ed.), *Le origini dei Greci: Dori e mondo egeo* (Rome and Bari, 1985), 37–71.

[21] For exegesis of this controversial passage see F. Meijer, 'Thucydides 1. 13. 2–4 and the Changes in Greek Shipbuilding', *Historia*, 37 (1988), 461–3.

[22] On this see L. Piccirilli, 'Questioni tucididee, II', *QS* 42 (1995), 65–80.

ing economic aspects, which are seen as determining factors in the historic process—and also to establish typologies of events which recurred afterwards. These first occurrences are always accompanied by qualifications—'as far as we know', 'it is said that', and similar expressions—which may be understood as indicating that the author is using a source.[23] On the Ionians' naval power Thucydides could have had information from his predecessors, Herodotus among them, who discusses Polycrates at some length. The brief mention of Rhenea deserves some reflection. Thucydides repeats the information more lengthily in 3. 104. 2. It has been suggested that it derives from an inscription that Thucydides could have seen at Delos,[24] but it must also be noted that Thucydides does not repeat the text of the inscription. In contrast to Herodotus, Thucydides reworks his sources much more extensively; he hardly ever declares them and tends to state a result rather than to present material discovered in the course of the enquiry. The statement on the battle of the Phocaeans and Carthaginians (1. 13. 6) has raised some discussion because it concerns a fact otherwise unknown: emending the text is unmethodical; one must note, however, that the event would not lie very far in the past (the dates proposed are 600 or *c.*540).[25] Still closer in time are the references to the Sicilian tyrants[26] and the Corcyraeans (1. 14. 2) and to the formation of the fleets of Athens and Aegina. Hornblower has most opportunely pointed out the difference between Herodotus' and Thucydides' judgement about Themistocles.

In the summing-up section of 1. 15–17—which intends to summarize the period between the Trojan war and the Persian wars—

[23] H. D. Westlake, '*Λέγεται* in Thucydides', *Mnemosyne*[4], 30 (1977), 345–62, considers Thucydides' *λέγεται* and *λέγονται*, like the many examples in Herodotus, to be indications of the use of a source in cases in which the reliability of information cannot be verified. So these expressions indicate more than uncertainty. See also R. L. Fowler, 'Herodotos and his Contemporaries', *JHS* 116 (1996), 62–87 at 71 (*λέγεται* as an implicit reference to a source) and 78 (the impersonal use of *λέγεται* implies a certain distance from the tradition, as if the latter needs to be verified).

[24] Perhaps in hexameters: F. Sieveking, 'Die Funktion geographischer Mitteilungen im Geschichtswerk des Thukydides', *Klio*, 42 (1964), 73–179; *contra* Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides*, i [n. 19], ad loc.

[25] On this question see M. Bats, 'Les silences d'Hérodote ou Marseille, Alalia et les Phocéens en Occident jusqu'à la fondation de Vélia', in B. D'Agostino and D. Ridgway (eds.), *Apoikia: Scritti in onore di G. Buchner* (*AIONarchstant*, NS 1; 1994), 133–48.

[26] On the references to the Sicilian tyrants in the Archaeology see N. Luraghi, 'La tirannide siceliota nell'Archaiologia di Tucidide', *QS* 42 (1995), 35–65.

the war between Chalcis and Eretria is the only ancient event. The brief Persian section (1. 16) is drawn essentially from Herodotus, as the almost literal quotation of Hdt. 1. 6. 1 makes clear. For the unimpressive record of the tyrants the reference by modern commentators to Herodotus (5. 78) marks a difference in perspectives. Herodotus, speaking of Athens, repeats the propagandistic opposition between tyranny and freedom. Thucydides gives a different explanation: the tyrants did not accomplish great deeds because they had to be careful to protect themselves and to increase the power of their families.

The references to Spartan history in 1. 18. 1 find correspondence in Herodotus,[27] as does the account of the Persian wars. With chapter 19 we are already in the present. The examples of unchecked and unreliable *ἀκοαί* of chapter 20 come from Herodotus, with the exception of the passage on the tyrannicides, which does not come from Hdt. 5. 55, in which Hipparchus is said to be the brother of the tyrant Hippias.

Let us look now to the statements relating to the measure of truth and reliability of information. The expressions indicating uncertainty or non-verifiable tradition are concentrated in the earliest period, before the Trojan war, and in the time included between the return of the Greeks from Troy and the era of Cyrus. The Trojan war is presented as a true fact: the discussion concerns its extent. In particular, attention must be called to Thucydides' elaborate claim of the superiority of the present war in 1. 1. 3 (the evidence which he trusts etc. ; cf. the beginning of 1. 20 and 1. 21. 1); to the passage relating to Minos (1. 4: *παλαίτατος ὢν ἀκοῇ ἴσμεν*); to the Peloponnesian tradition on Agamemnon (1. 9. 2); to the discussion of the archaeological and Homeric evidence (1. 10. 3: *ἀπιστεῖν*, *πιστεύειν*). Furthermore, note expressions like *φαίνεται* in 1. 2. 1, 1. 3. 1, and 1. 9. 4, *φαίνονται* in 1. 11. 1, *μοι δοκεῖ* in 1. 9. 1 and 1. 9. 3 (cf. 1. 3. 2), and *φαίνεται* in 1. 14. 1, which indicate Thucydides' reworking of the data supplied by tradition—the epic tradition, probably including the Epic Cycle.[28] The *λέγονται* of 1.

[27] On the short history of Sparta in 1. 18 see A. Paradiso, 'Tempo della tradizione, tempo dello storico: Thuc. I 18 e la storia arcaica spartana', *Storia della storiografia*, 28 (1995), 35–45.

[28] See Hunter, 'Thucydides and the Uses of the Past' [n. 18], 197 n. 27 (in 1. 19. 4 *φαίνεται* indicates that Thucydides is not prepared to state the Homeric evidence as plain fact) and 199 (the use of *φαίνεται* and *εἰκός* indicates a personal thesis: apropos of 1. 10).

13. 2 refers to the reported tradition,[29] while the following *φαίνεται* is more difficult to interpret—perhaps indicating information taken from a text which is unclear and called for elaboration?—but is in any case a disclaimer.

3. *Ancient History Denied*

In general, to Thucydides the history of the distant past as reconstructed by poets and *λογογράφοι* is not trustworthy (1. 21. 1). Remoteness in time and the difficulty in finding verification cause the most ancient events to shift *ἐπὶ τὸ μυδῶδες*.[30] In opposition to the reconstruction of poets and *λογογράφοι* Thucydides offers his own, based on the clearest signs.

But his refusal to trust completely in epic poetry and the *λογογράφοι* leads Thucydides to discard almost all the stories that had been handed down about the earliest times and to criticize severely information that had been considered quite reliable: the Catalogue of Ships in 1. 10. 4–5. The possibility of using archaeology remains but in practice this is, however, almost negligible (1. 10. 1–3).

The only real resource at the disposition of the historian who tries to go far back in time is the logic of analogy[31] and of verisimilitude,[32] which creates a backbone, a mechanism of cause and effect, but almost completely devoid of facts—at least for the most remote periods. The Lelantine war (1. 15. 3) is an exception.[33] A more continuous sequence of events begins only with Cyrus and Croesus (1. 16), that is, more or less with the chronological boundary which Herodotus also reached—as Vannicelli has shown. Finley, who dealt with the Archaeology in one of the densest pages of *The Use and Abuse of History* (London, 1971), understood this very

[29] So Westlake, '*Λέγεται* in Thucydides' [n. 23], 358.

[30] According to the traditional interpretation; but see S. Flory, 'The Meaning of *τὸ μὴ μυθώδες* (1. 22. 4) and the Usefulness of Thucydides' *History*', *CJ* 85 (1990), 193–208 at 201: 'Sentimental and chauvinistic accounts [sc. of the Persian wars] have gradually won out over others and so are untrustworthy.'

[31] See L. Canfora, *Analogia e storia: L'uso politico dei paradigmi storici* (Milan, 1982), and A. Corcella, *Erodoto e l'analogia* (Palermo, 1984).

[32] See J. Gommel, *Rhetorisches Argumentieren bei Thukydides* (Hildesheim, 1966).

[33] On the Lelantine war see most recently V. Parker, *Untersuchungen zum lelantischen Krieg und verwandten Problemen der frühgriechischen Geschichte* (*Historia* Einzelschr. 109; Stuttgart, 1997).

well. Thucydides had Herodotus at his disposal for the more recent period—Finley affirms—but for more ancient times he had 'nothing to go on other than Homer and other "ancient poets", tradition, complementary evidence, and a very powerful and disciplined mind' (p. 18).[34] From this viewpoint the Archaeology is not history but 'a general sociological theory, a theory about power and progress, applied retrospectively to the past, and applied, one must add, with caution and hesitation, for, as Thucydides explains at the outset, one cannot achieve certainty about ancient times, one can merely say that this is what all the "signs" point to' (p. 19). Of course one can question the conclusion, founded on a purely *événementiel* concept of history, but one cannot but share the observation that 'Among the signs are astonishingly few concrete events' (p. 19).

One might consider the Archaeology as the statement of motives for a failure and a choice: the choice of contemporary history. The *spatium historicum* that Herodotus had defined by the shifting boundaries of oral tradition has become even more restricted.[35] The only positive result seems to be the one declared in 1. 21. 1–2: the Peloponnesian war is greater than all the wars preceding it. We might well ask, then, if this was one of the principal aims of this section. The link between the Archaeology and the methodological chapters transforms it into a methodological premiss, into a programme that aims at excluding all other competitors: poetry on the one hand and all genealogical and historical writings on the other. Competition with predecessors conditions the scrutiny and therefore, in part, the reconstruction: the Archaeology is not modern objective reconstruction but is selective and biased.[36] Just as the whole work of Thucydides is selective and biased.

The Archaeology, extolling the method of circumstantial reconstruction of the past put forward by Thucydides, is the categorical affirmation of the failure of all those who relied on other methods

[34] Cf. also H.-J. Gehrke, 'Thukydides und die Rekonstruktion des Historischen', *A&A* 39 (1993), 1–19 at 9, on the reconstruction of the past as a conscious process of thought.

[35] On this theme I refer to P. Vannicelli, *Erodoto e la storia dell'alto e medio arcaismo* (*Sparta–Tessaglia–Cirene*) (Rome, 1993), and to Vannicelli's contribution to this volume. See also L. Canfora, 'L'inizio della storia secondo i Greci', *QS* 33 (1991), 5–19 at 7–8: Ephorus, who extends the *spatium historicum*, misunderstands Thucydides' Archaeology, where myth is seen as circumstantial evidence of facts not otherwise knowable and is used for periods for which it would be impossible to give any detailed narrative.

[36] See de Romilly, *Histoire et raison* [n. 7], 284–5.

of reconstructing the distant past.[37] Jacqueline de Romilly said: 'L'inconnu, en effet, a été dominé.'[38] But Thucydides' command over the history of the past serves only to affirm the superiority of the present and of those who are able to explain it. So we are faced with an articulate negation first of all attempts to write history that is not contemporary; second of all methods which differ from the circumstantial, which, however, succeeds only in giving an idea of the importance of events; and third of the importance and paradigmatic value of the most outstanding events of the past with respect to those of the present. The demonstration of these three theses is the backbone of the Archaeology and this justifies the attempt I proposed at the beginning to describe it in terms of epideictic discourse.

4. *Thucydides and Oral Traditions*

At the beginning of the *Phaedo* Plato stages a discussion between Socrates, Simmias, and Cebes which grows out of Evenus' interest in Socrates' poetry. Socrates explains why he has taken to writing poetry and sends a message to Evenus inviting him to follow him as soon as possible. Simmias replies that Evenus seems to have no intention of following him and Socrates asks: 'Isn't Evenus a philosopher?' At Simmias' affirmative reply Socrates says that

[37] The problem of the relationship between the methods of Herodotus and Thucydides requires its own study. One must, however, make some observations. Fowler, 'Herodotos and his Contemporaries' [n. 23], 76, underlines the substantial continuity between Herodotus and the Thucydides of the Archaeology: the language and the technique of Thucydides in the Archaeologies of books 1 and 6 indicate that Herodotus' methods were recognized as the most appropriate way to find out the truth about the distant past. But one must observe that the connection between the chapters on method and the Archaeology, together with the observation that it is impossible *σαφῶς εὑρεῖν* ancient events, seems at least in part to deny this continuity. A further problem is that of the continuity of method between the Archaeology and the rest of Thucydides' work (see above all the observations of P. Butti De Lima, *L'inchiesta e la prova: Immagine storiografica, pratica giuridica e retorica nella Grecia classica* (Turin, 1996), 116 ff., and the opposing views of Woodman, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography* [n. 1], 5 ff.; see also de Romilly's position, *Histoire et raison* [n. 7], 243: the intellectual methods employed by Thucydides are always the same, but in the Archaeology they are pushed further than in the other parts of the work; cf. also 297–8): it is evident that some techniques (e.g. analogy and verisimilitude) are the same, but one must, however, point out the differences in subject, function, and logical structure that in part condition even the method of enquiry.

[38] *Histoire et raison* [n. 7], 273.

Evenus will certainly want to follow him but will not do violence to himself as this is against the law. At this point Cebes intervenes:

> 'Socrates, what do you mean by saying that it is not legitimate to do oneself violence, although a philosopher will be willing to follow a friend who dies?'
>
> 'Why, Cebes, have you and Simmias never heard [*οὐ ἀκηκόατε*] about these things while you have been with Philolaus?'
>
> 'Nothing definite [*οὐδέν γε σαφές*], Socrates.'
>
> 'Well, even my information is only based on hearsay [*ἐξ ἀκοῆς*], but I don't mind at all telling you what I have heard [*τυγχάνω ἀκηκοώς*]. I suppose that for one who is soon to leave this world there is no more suitable occupation than enquiring into our views about the future life, and trying to imagine what it is like. What else can one do in the time before sunset?'
>
> 'Tell me then, Socrates, what are the grounds for saying that suicide is not legitimate? I have heard [*ἤκουσα*] it described as wrong before now (as you suggested) both by Philolaus, when he was staying with us, and by others as well; but I have never yet heard any definite explanation for it [*σαφὲς . . . οὐδὲν ἀκήκοα*].'
>
> 'Well, you must not lose heart—he said—perhaps you are about to hear one [*τάχα γὰρ ἂν καὶ ἀκούσαις*]' (61 D 3–62 A 1, trans. H. Tredennick and H. Tarrant)

The philosophical and literary density of this passage is extraordinary but this is not the place to analyse it. What is interesting for us is the contrast established between *σαφές* and *ἀκοή*. Cebes declares that he has heard nothing *σαφές*, and Socrates replies that he too is speaking *ἐξ ἀκοῆς*. Words related to the semantic field of *σαφές* and of listening come back at the end of the passage I have quoted, when Socrates begins a series of reflections about giving death to oneself and about the metaphor of the prison. While the term *σαφές* indicates precise knowledge (cf. Thuc 1. 22. 4), the words concerning hearing clearly have a particular semantic pregnancy. On the one hand *ἀκούω* has the common meaning 'to listen'—to opinions about the subject under discussion; on the other, it clearly means 'to understand' in the sense of acquiring knowledge of something. But to which of these two meanings does Socrates' *ἐξ ἀκοῆς* refer? The ambiguity of the expression is explained in what follows from Socrates reply: the subject is the journey Socrates is about to make. It is this point of the reply that brings about the semantic shift, typical of Socratic irony, from the area of imprecise know-

ledge about something that one has heard from someone (e.g. from Philolaus), to the much more significant area of knowledge possible only ἐξ ἀκοῆς, that is, by listening to the opinions of someone who has reflected on the subject, as knowledge relative to suicide and, in general, to death must be.

So about some things one may have knowledge which is only ἐξ ἀκοῆς and this knowledge—which by definition cannot be certain—is, however, of primary importance. From Plato's passage it can be deduced that ἐξ ἀκοῆς indicates a lower level of knowledge—for example, compared to knowledge one acquires by seeing something—but we must not forget that here the issue is not knowledge of a straightforward fact, but knowledge of the mystery of death.

Now let us return to history. The historian who is dedicated to the history of the distant past is similar to the philosopher who is investigating death: facts about the most remote past are ἀνεξέλεγκτα (1. 21. 1). They are not the object of autoptic knowledge and cannot be checked—e.g. by comparing the versions of more than one witness, that is, by applying the method outlined in 1. 22. Knowledge of the most ancient facts depends on the correct interpretation of circumstantial evidence. As Thucydides says, if it is impossible to find out σαφῶς about events preceding the present or belonging to still more remote periods, it is nevertheless possible to assess their significance by means of circumstantial evidence, signs, as it were (1. 1. 3). This principle explains the dryness of the Archaeology, its structure—a chain of causes and effects—and the persistent quest for connections. Of course this is true above all for the most distant past, but it is necessary to note that Thucydides extends the impossibility of reconstructing history with certainty to all periods that are not contemporary (1. 1. 3: τὰ πρὸ αὐτῶν).[39] This extension is related to Thucydides' aim of creating a political archetype.

What, then, is Thucydides' attitude to the oral traditions? If the caution and commitment described in 1. 22. 1–2—where Thucydides insists that distortions of the truth are possible even in the words of eyewitnesses to an event—are necessary in order to write contemporary history, the task of reconstructing the history of a more distant past must be for Thucydides hopeless. Witnesses of

[39] The best interpretation of the passage is the one of L. Canfora, 'La préface de Thucydide et la critique de la raison historique', *RÉG* 90 (1977), 455–61: τὰ πρὸ αὐτῶν refers to all the ἔργα of the past, starting from the Persian wars, the last important event that preceded the Peloponnesian war. The same interpretation had been put forward by Köhler, 'Über die Archäologie des Thukydides' [n. 8], 370.

events can no longer be found and the historian must resort to those who collected their testimony and handed it down. And this could happen both through an uninterrupted oral tradition (as in the murder of Hipparchus) and also through an oral tradition that has been written down (epics, the *λογογράφοι*). But in the course of only a few generations the oral tradition can change (as indeed it did in the case of Hipparchus), while poets tend to embroider the facts (1. 10. 3; 21. 1) and *λογογράφοι* to make them more appealing for the audience (1. 21. 1). The only field where there is certainty of knowledge is contemporary history, where, thanks to the efforts of the investigator, the *ἀκοαί* can be pinned down in a solid framework and secured against the dangers of transmission. Thucydides makes a passing reference to the untrustworthiness of the *ἀκοαί* regarding the past in 1. 23. 3, where, referring to earthquakes, eclipses, droughts, and epidemics, he says that for the past they are *ἀκοῇ μὲν λεγόμενα, ἔργῳ δὲ σπανιώτερον βεβαιούμενα*, while now they *οὐκ ἄπιστα κατέστη*.

Thucydides seems to make a clear distinction between contemporary or recent oral tradition which can be subject to verification (the use of words in the negative for verification is important: *ἀβασανίστως*, *ἀνεξέλεγκτα*) and the more ancient traditions which escape verification. Thucydides does not, as modern anthropologists do,[40] pause to evaluate the longevity or trustworthiness of oral traditions, but seems to have a very clear idea of the essential difference between the most ancient and unverifiable traditions and those more recent and verifiable. What is the threshold that divides the two categories? This varies according to the quality of the traditions, the type of information they transmit, the conditions in which they have been preserved, etc. The fact remains that in order to give an example of a mistaken oral tradition Thucydides cites the killing of Hipparchus, a relatively recent event. The error that he has discovered in this single case—Thucydides seems to imply—could occur an infinite number of times at the same chronological level. The threshold therefore seems to be very close in time and this depends above all on Thucydides' decision to write a history that is both selective and paradigmatic.[41] As we have seen in rela-

[40] Thomas, *Oral Tradition and Written Records* [n. 12], 4–5: oral traditions do not have as such a characteristic degree of reliability, each must be evaluated individually.

[41] On this point see R. Nicolai, *La storiografia nell'educazione antica* (Pisa, 1992), 63 ff., where I discuss T. Cole, 'Le origini della retorica', *QUCC*, NS 23 (1986),

tion to 1. 1. 3, he excludes any history that is not contemporary. At the same time he demonstrated that it is possible not to accept a tradition *ἀβασανίστως* but, if opportunities to check it exist (and this is so in the case of Hipparchus—a local Athenian tradition not too remote in time), then it is possible to correct the errors. It follows that Thucydides not only uses predominantly oral sources (here I use the word 'source' in a completely generic sense), as has been abundantly recognized,[42] but knows how to use them and lets it be clearly understood that he has examined the problem of their reliability in relation to their chronology.

The passage in the Archaeology on the murder of Hipparchus deserves a brief digression because it has to be compared with the more detailed account given in 6. 53. 3–60. 1.[43] The context is the Athenians' determination in investigating the profanation of the mysteries and the mutilation of the Herms. The cause of the tenacity of the demos is to be sought for in the recollection of the distant episode of the Pisistratids, a story which the Athenians knew *ἀκοῇ* (6. 53. 3). The story that follows also has a demonstrative purpose, just like that of the Archaeology: to argue (6. 54. 1: *ἀποφανῶ*) that neither the Athenians nor anyone else had accurate (*ἀκριβές*) knowledge about their own tyrants and about what had happened then. It must be noted that, given the subject, this section ends borrowing structures and techniques characteristic of forensic prose. Thucydides repeats that Pisistratus had been succeeded not by Hipparchus but by Hippias.[44] He goes on to tell of the sexual advances that Hipparchus made to Harmodius and what Aristogeiton first planned to do when he was informed of the fact. The

7–21, and R. Nicolai, '*Κτῆμα ἐς ἀεί*: Aspetti della fortuna di Tucidide nel mondo antico', *RFIC* 123 (1995), 5–26.

[42] Thomas, *Oral Tradition and Written Records* [n. 12], 4, with good bibliography in the footnote.

[43] Cf. H.-J. Diesner, 'Peisistratidenexkurs und Peisistratidenbild bei Thukydides', *Historia*, 8 (1959), 12–22; P. Barcelò, *Basileia, Monarchia, Tyrannis: Untersuchungen zu Entwicklung und Beurteilung von Alleinherrschaft im vorhellenistischen Griechenland* (*Historia* Einzelschr. 79; Stuttgart, 1993), 187 ff.; and A. Tsakmakis, 'Thukydides VI 51. 1 und Herodot', *Philologus*, 140 (1996), 201–13. On the oral traditions relating to the end of the tyranny see Thomas, *Oral Tradition and Written Records* [n. 12], 238 ff.

[44] See D. M. Lewis, 'The Tyranny of the Pisistratidae', *CAH* iv, 2nd edn. (Cambridge, 1988), 288–302: Thucydides, although sometimes apparently alluding to a power held jointly, goes too far in the attempt to show that Hippias was the tyrant even before Hipparchus' death. It looks as if Thucydides in his argument has forced the evidence, rather than misunderstanding it.

judgement on the Pisistratid tyranny (6. 54. 5–6) is crucial to the interpretation of the whole passage: this judgement is substantially positive and completely opposed to the oral tradition which emphasized the harshness of the tyranny towards its final stage (6. 53. 3). So tradition is in error not only in identifying Hipparchus as the tyrant in power at the moment of his murder but also in assessing as harsh the last phase of the Pisistratid tyranny: as Thucydides says a little later (6. 59. 2), it became harsh only after Hipparchus had been killed. The forensic nature of this section—so to speak—is confirmed by the use of inscriptions as evidence (6. 54. 6–55. 2) and by the hypothetical *argumentatio* set out in 6. 54. 3. The inscription cited in 6. 55. 1–2 is furthermore used to support the argument that Hippias held power because he was older than his brother—a piece of information which Thucydides attributes to a more precise oral tradition (once more ἀκοῇ). The account continues: the desire of the conspirators to act before being discovered (6. 57. 2–3) closely adheres to the briefer account in 1. 20. 2. The recapitulative conclusion of this section (6. 60. 1) again takes up the theme of memory in oral tradition and better explains the connection between the suspicions of the Athenians and recollection of the Pisistratids: they feared an oligarchic and tyrannic conspiracy. Thucydides points out that the Athenians made mistakes because their incorrect knowledge of the past induced them to misinterpret the present: the danger came not from Alcibiades or from a pretended oligarchic conspiracy, but from the Athenian demos itself or from those of its representatives who wanted to kill at birth any attempt to establish an oligarchy. It was indeed the killing of Hipparchus that made tyranny harsher and afterwards provoked the Spartan intervention. (The Spartans were joined by the Alcmaeonids, 6. 59. 4: here too Thucydides seems to correct the oral tradition reported in 6. 53. 3.[45])

Thucydides' insistence is clearly related to political interests of his own time, but his method of argument throws light on the use he made of oral traditions, in particular of those which reach the critical threshold between more recent and verifiable memories (the three generations of Herodotus) and those more distant and impossible to authenticate. Thucydides behaves like an orator at a trial: he collects evidence and develops his arguments with the subtle

[45] See Paradiso, 'Tempo della tradizione, tempo dello historico' [n. 27], 36: the Thucydidean version of the murder of Hipparchus is unpatriotic.

dialectic characteristic of judicial oratory. Not only that: the narrative sections have an explicit tendency towards judicial *διήγησις*. Demonstration forces him to use a different technique from the one he uses for contemporary history: to go back in time is not only—or not so much—to reconstruct the past as to challenge the ideological use of the past by his fellow citizens and, it seems to me, to propose an alternative. The different treatment reserved for this excursus reaffirms, if need be, the choice in favour of contemporary history.

Now in order to make credible the proposition that contemporary history is the only possible history it is not sufficient to declare on methodological grounds its superior reliability, but it is necessary to demonstrate the paradigmatic value of the event chosen. To do this Thucydides must go back and belittle the other possible paradigms, confronting his predecessors on their own ground, where necessary: from this point of view, the confrontation with epic poetry and with Herodotus is ubiquitous. Thucydides repeatedly underlines the importance of the Peloponnesian war (1. 1. 1 *ἐλπίσας μέγαν τε ἔσεσθαι καὶ ἀξιολογώτατον τῶν προγεγενημένων*; 1. 1. 2 *κίνησις γὰρ αὕτη μεγίστη* etc.; 1. 19 *ἡ ἰδία παρασκευὴ μείζων* etc.; 1. 21. 2 *ὁ πόλεμος οὗτος . . . δηλώσει . . . μείζων* etc.; 1. 23. 1–3 infinite suffering and natural phenomena), at the same time belittling past events (1. 1. 3 *οὐ μεγάλα νομίζω*; 1. 2. 3 *οὔτε μεγέθει πόλεων ἴσχυον* etc.; 1. 3. 1 *τῶν παλαιῶν ἀσθένειαν* etc.; 1. 3. 4 *οὐδὲν πρὸ τῶν Τρωικῶν . . . ἔπραξαν*; 1. 10. 3 *νομίζειν δὲ τὴν στρατείαν ἐκείνην μεγίστην μὲν γενέσθαι τῶν πρὸ αὐτῆς, λειπομένη δὲ τῶν νῦν*; 1. 11. 2 *ἀλλὰ δι' ἀχρηματίαν τά τε πρὸ τούτων ἀσθενῆ ἦν* etc.; 1. 14. 1 *τριήρεσι μὲν ὀλίγαις* etc.; 1. 14. 3 *καὶ αὗται οὔπω εἶχον διὰ πάσης καταστρώματα*; 1. 15. 2 *κατὰ γῆν δὲ πόλεμος, ὅθεν τις κἂν δύναμις περιεγένετο, οὐδεὶς ξυνέστη*; 1. 17 *ἐπράχθη δὲ οὐδὲν ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἔργον ἀξιόλογον*; 1. 23. 1 the Persian wars were resolved by two naval battles and two battles on land). It is worth pointing out that while praise of the present war is located at the beginning and at the end according to normal oratorical procedure, the many expressions directed to limit the relevance of previous events are scattered in a fairly regular way throughout the Archaeology, as if the aim of the argument were indeed to demonstrate the inferiority of preceding events.

The relationship with epic and with Herodotus is more complex than that with the oral sources. Epic has the twofold character of written source, with its specific literary features (amplification),

and also of a competing and alternative diegetic genre.[46] To belittle the reliability of epic (1. 10. 3; 1. 21. 1) means belittling both the relevance and the paradigmatic value of the events sung by the bards. Thucydides' zeal in discussing the epic tradition concerning the Trojan war derives both from the need to belittle that war in comparison with the present conflict and also from his own intention to replace epic as a 'book of culture'. Moreover, his choice to single out the Catalogue of Ships as a source from which to make deductions and gain information can be seen as an aspect of the competition in which Thucydides engages with Herodotus. While Herodotus almost parades his refusal to use the epic as a source,[47] Thucydides undertakes to make use of it, trying to distinguish in it what is trustworthy and what is simply poetic embroidery.[48]

Beside the many and obvious differences between epic and Thucydides' work, there is a notable element of continuity. Just as the *Iliad* tells of one single war—or rather of some moments chosen from the last year of the Trojan war—so does Thucydides limit himself to the Peloponnesian war. Perhaps to him Herodotus' work in its final written version appeared as a sort of cycle which in the attempt to cover a large number of events and subjects ended up losing the paradigmatic nature characteristic of the *Iliad*. Of course, while the epic is a true book of culture in Lotman's sense, Thucydides' work concentrates on a single aspect—politico-military history, with which he means to form the minds of the future ruling classes. In this sense one may well say that Thucydides is the inventor of a new *τέχνη*: the book of culture is refined and adapted to a new political context and to new techniques of communication.

Let us turn to the relationship with Herodotus.[49] The limitation that Thucydides attributes to the *λογογράφοι* is their giving

[46] Cf. H. Funke, 'Poesia e storiografia', *QS* 23 (1986), 71–93 at 80: Thucydides is the first to see poetry 'as an expression qualitatively different from history'. For the relationship with epic see particularly L. Canfora, *Totalità e selezione nella storiografia classica* (Bari, 1972), esp. 21 ff. and 71 ff.

[47] Cf. Funke, "Poesia e storiografia' [n. 47], 79: in contrast to Hecataeus, Herodotus does not take poetry as the point of departure of his criticism.

[48] For a different position see Funke, ibid. 80–1: Thucydides deduces the historicity of the Trojan war from witnesses (the oral traditions of 1. 9) and from logical considerations *κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον* (e.g. apropos of the scarcity of resources), to which the archaeological evidence must be added; therefore, poetry is cited by Thucydides only as an accessory illustration to facts established on other grounds. See also ibid. 84 on Thucydides' constant concern to get rid of Homer's authority.

[49] The work of reference on the relationship between Thucydides and Herodotus is Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides*, ii [n. 8], 19–38 and 122–45.

more care to what attracts an audience rather than to what is true (1. 21. 1). One might dispute the meaning of *ἀληθέστερον* in this passage—and in general of words connected by way of meaning to the semantic field of 'truth': the contrast Thucydides establishes with his reconstruction *ἐκ τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων σημείων* clearly shows that the 'truth' here referred to is not much more than anything which is attested or documented in some way.[50] This passage is to be read together with 1. 22. 4: what attracts the public is the *μυθώδες*, literally that which has the characteristics of *μῦθος*, which I take to mean 'story' and, forcing it a little, 'traditional tale'.[51] The works of the *λογογράφοι* report stories which are unverifiable both because they belong to the distant past and also because the aim to attract the public has not compelled the *λογογράφοι* to behave as scrupulous investigators. These stories, which, it must be added, range over a large area, cannot then aspire to be truly paradigmatic: Thucydides senses the differences between Homer and the *λογογράφοι*, but he ends up putting them side by side (1. 21. 1), almost recognizing implicitly the common epic roots of every type of historical narrative. The conclusion is that even for recent events like the Persian wars, although an account can be given in general outline (1. 18), not all the details which are usually accepted at face value are credible: the *πρότερον* of 1. 23. 3, relative to exceptional deeds related in the oral tradition, is exactly paralleled by *τὰ πρὸ αὐτῶν* in 1. 1. 3.

Thucydides raises the problem of the chronological threshold for the credibility of oral tradition. His answer is a very reductive one: only the most recent history can be the object of accurate scrutiny and trustworthy reconstruction. Anything that does not satisfy these standards cannot become a paradigm.

[50] The semantic field of 'truth' has been far less investigated than that of 'falsehood' and 'lie', connected to the study of fiction: see C. Gill and T. P. Wiseman (eds.), *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World* (Exeter, 1993), and my review, *Athenaeum*, 84 (1996), 273–81.

[51] Cf. Flory, 'The Meaning of *τὸ μὴ μυθώδες*' [n. 30], 193–4, who narrows it down to 'stories which exaggerate and celebrate the glories of war', i.e. patriotically oriented stories.

14

Myth, History, and Collective Identity: Uses of the Past in Ancient Greece and Beyond

HANS-JOACHIM GEHRKE

RECENT research into early Greek historiography has considerably clarified the relationships between historical traditions and their location inside society; the present book is part of this effort. The prominence thus given to the 'social surface' of tradition is capable not only of clarifying the complex interrelationships between past and present, but also of sharpening our sense of the socio-political function and the argumentative and ideological significance of references to the past, in their respective milieux and situations. Social knowledge of the past, in other words that which a society knows and holds for true about its past, its 'intentional history', is of fundamental significance for the *imaginaire*, for the way a society interprets and understands itself, and therefore for its inner coherence and ultimately its collective identity. Given this background, it seems not inappropriate to contribute an article to this volume which, casting a glance outwards, so to speak, takes as its theme this very function of mythico-historical tradition, by

This article presents the first results of the ancient history section of an interdisciplinary research group of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft at the University of Freiburg, with the theme 'Identities and the Other', in which the initiator of the workshop and the author of these pages, among others, are investigating together the significance of conceptions of the past for the construction of identity by Greek societies. A version of this paper was presented at the conference 'Mythos, Symbole und Rituale: Die Geschichtsmächtigkeit der "Zeichen" in Südosteuropa im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert' (University of Bonn, 15–17 Sept. 1997) and has appeared in the transactions of the conference, edited by D. Dahlmann and W. Potthoff (Frankfurt a.M., 2000), 1–24.

taking a look at ancient history and its after-effects since the Renaissance.

I

Early in the year 208 BC[1] the citizens of a polis in Asia Minor, Magnesia on the Maeander, went about enhancing the status of the most important cult of their city (after an attempt on a smaller scale undertaken thirteen years before).[2] The goddess Artemis Leukophryene, or Artemis with the white eyebrows, made a personal appearance. The Delphic oracle was consulted on the matter, and the god Apollo, brother of Artemis, interpreted the vision:[3] a particularly splendid festival for Artemis should be instituted forthwith, to be held every four years, and to consist of a sacrifice and procession as well as musical, gymnastic, and equestrian *ἀγῶνες*, i.e. competitions for poets and singers and sports contests.[4] The

[1] For the date (by inclusive reckoning) see J. Ebert, 'Zur Stiftungsurkunde der *Λευκοφρυηνά* in Magnesia am Mäander (Inschr. v. Magn. 16)', *Philologus*, 126 (1982), 198–216 at 206; K. J. Rigsby, *Asylia: Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1996), 180, 182, 189.

[2] For the character of this festival (cash-prize *ἀγών*) see Ebert, 'Zur Stiftungsurkunde der *Λευκοφρυηνά*' [n. 1], 202–3. On the interpretation of the situation between this first attempt and the extension in 208 Ebert, 205–6, is preferable to Rigsby, *Asylia* [n. 1], 180: the older festival was not abolished but took place throughout the period; Ebert's interpretation of *παρηλκύσθησ[αν* in *IvM* 16. 24 is the more plausible. Attractive, if hypothetical, considerations on the historico-political background in Rigsby, 183–4. S. Dušanić, 'The *κτίσις Μαγνησίας*, Philip V and the Panhellenic Leukophryena', *Epigraphica*, 45 (1983), 11–48, lays great emphasis on the role of Philip V, but caution is necessary: at the relevant period the Magnesians also had good relationships with the Aetolians; see the sources cited by Ph. Gauthier, *Symbola: Les Étrangers et la justice dans les cités grecques* (Nancy, 1972), 260, 272 ff. In general, and especially if one takes into account the royal letters (see below), one tends to get the impression that the Magnesians had considerable scope for action in all directions; on the historical context see now also M. Flashar, 'Panhellenische Feste und Asyl', *Klio*, 81 (1999), 412–36.

[3] *IvM* 16 (now always to be read in the version of Ebert, 'Zur Stiftungsurkunde der *Λευκοφρυηνά* [n. 1]), 10 ff.

[4] *IvM* 16. 20 ff.; sacrifice and procession: *IvM* 31. 21; 33. 11, 16–17; 35. 11, 25; 36. 18; 37. 8, 27; 38. 14, 31–2; 39. 16, 28; 40. 15; 41. 9–10.; 42. 8; 43. 16–17; 44. 5 ff., 17, 19–20; 45. 14–15; 46. 19 ff.; 48. 19; 50. 20, 34; 52. 13, 18–19; 53. 8; 54. 5–6, 23; 55. 20, 24; 56. 13–14; 57. 7–8, 27; 58. 4–5, 32; 60. 14–15; 61. 26–7, 56; 62. 4; 63. 8; 66. 5–6; 68. 1; 70. 15–16; 72. 6, 19; 73. 18; 79. 6, 20; 81. 3; 82. 1–2; 85. 6, 16–17; 86. 7–8, 15; 87. 7, 19; Rigsby, *Asylia* [n. 1], nos. 78. 3; 79. 11—competitions: 22. 8–9; 31. 21–2; 32. 8; 33. 13–14; 37. 9; 38. 15–16, 34; 39. 17–18; 41. 13; 42. 9–10; 43. 18–19, 28–9; 44. 7–8; 45. 16–17; 46. 20–1; 50. 21–2; 52. 14–15; 53. 9–10; 54. 7–8;

games should have the same status as the venerable Pythian games at Delphi and be provided with a wreath worth 50 gold staters (about 700–800 grams) as the prize for victory.[5] Because of the significance of its deity and festival, the city and its territory were to be sacred and inviolable.[6] Therefore the Magnesians applied to the most important kings and to numerous Greek cities and leagues for recognition of the new cult and a guarantee of sacred truce. Their own resolutions and documents relating to this, and the replies of the sovereigns and cities, they had inscribed at the central point of their city, on the inside of the great stoa at the west end of the agora.[7] There a good number of blocks and fragments were uncovered by the excavations of Carl Humann and Otto Kern in 1891 and 1892, comprising about two-thirds of the original material.[8] These were brought to the Berliner Antikensammlung and published in

56. 15–16; 57. 8–9; 58. 6–7, 31; 61. 28–9, 58; 62. 5–6, 29–30; 63. 9–10; 78. 8; 79. 7; 82. 4–5; 85. 6; 86. 8; 87. 7–8; on the order of events see O. Kern, 'Magnetische Studien', *Hermes*, 36 (1901), 491–515 at 512 ff.

[5] *IvM* 18. 14–15; 19. 13–14; 22. 6 ff.; 31. 21, 28–9; 32. 9, 24; 33. 13, 17–18; 34. 11–12, 19; 35. 12, 22; 36. 19; 37. 8–9, 17, 28–9; 38. 15, 33, 50; 39. 17, 28–9; 41. 12–13; 42. 10 ff.; 43. 18, 27–8; 44. 8, 21–2; 45. 16; 46. 20, 22, 29–30; 47. 5, 20; 48. 9, 15–16; 49. 6; 50. 21, 35–6; 52. 14, 29; 53. 9; 54. 25; 56. 15; 57. 9; 58. 6, 30–1; 60. 15–16; 61. 38, 57; 62. 5, 29; 63. 9; 71. 10; 72. 20–1, 30; 73. 113–14; 78. 8, 19; 79. 7; 82. 3–4; 85. 6, 17, 20; 86. 8; 87. 7; Rigsby. *Asylia* [n. 1], nos. 78. 3–4; 79. 11–12, 19–20.

[6] *IvM* 16. 4, 8 ff., 32–3; 31. 18–19; 32. 25–6; 33. 5–6; 34. 13, 19–20; 35. 23–4; 36. 12–13; 16–17; 37. 18–19, 29–30; 38. 17–18, 36–7; 39. 8–9, 19–20, 30–1; 42. 14–15; 43. 9–10, 20–1; 44. 35–6; 45. 11–12, 27 ff.; 46. 18, 32–3; 48. 10–11, 16–17; 50. 33–4, 39–40; 52. 9–10, 29–30; 53. 5–6, 34 ff.; 54. 13–14, 27–8; 56. 9 ff.; 58. 4–5; 62. 1–2, 31–2; 63. 5–6, 24–5; 71. 15–16; 72. 31 ff.; 73. 11 ff.; 78. 21–2; 79. 3 ff.; 85. 18; Rigsby, *Asylia* [n. 1], no. 79. 23; see also Kern, 'Magnetische Studien' [n. 4], 512, and on the phenomenon of *ἀσυλία* see now Rigsby, *passim*.

[7] Since Ebert's ingenious new restoration at *IvM* 16. 15 ('Zur Stiftungsurkunde der *Λευκοφρυηνά*' [n. 1], 201–2), the previous *terminus post quem* of 200 (Kern, 'Magnetische Studien' [n. 4], 494) for the cutting of the inscription has been discredited. Ebert, 216, conjectures attractively that the erection of the inscriptions was carried out to herald the second games in 203. However, this question must remain open because of the problems of the archaeological and architectural dating of the whole complex (agora together with temple of Zeus Sosipolis, new temple of Artemis and altar; see n. 13 below): if the complex belongs together *in toto* and, above all, the temple of Artemis is to be dated later, another *terminus post quem* follows; for the cutting of the monumental inscriptions obviously presupposes the prior existence of the building. In the face of this it must be emphasized that Ebert's conjecture has many points in its favour on internal grounds: one would be reluctant to accept the passing of over half a century between the institution of the new festival and the putting up of the inscriptions which were so important for its acceptance.

[8] Rigsby, *Asylia*, [n. 1], 180. Excavations were opened again in the 1980s; on the new researches in Magnesia cf. O. Bingöl, 'Zu den neueren Forschungen in Magne-

1900 by Kern.[9] In these inscriptions we have at our disposal a most instructive and meaningful dossier on the theme of myth, history, and collective identity.

The worship of the goddess Artemis Leukophryene was the centre of interest of the citizen body of Magnesia. The ancient cult, which is already attested for the archaic period,[10] formed as it were the centre of the life of the polis.[11] For centuries it constituted the identity of the community. The city could also be called Leukophrys.[12] This identity was also visible to the outsider: in all probability it was already in connection with the above-mentioned upgrading of the cult[13] that a massive temple, the work of the em-

sia', in W. Hoepfner and E. L. Schwander (eds.), *Hermogenes und die hochhellenistische Architektur* (Mainz, 1990), 63–7.

[9] *IvM* 16–87, with the important new edition of Ebert, 'Zur Stiftungsurkunde der *Λευκοφρυηνά*' [n. 1], and now Rigsby, *Asylia* [n. 1], 185 ff. (nos. 66–77, 80–131). Two Delphic inscriptions of the Aetolian league and of the polis of Delphi can now be added: these were first edited by H. van Effenterre and dated to 208/7 ('Inscriptions de Delphes', *BCH* 77 (1953), 166–76 at 168 ff.); see Rigsby, nos. 78–9.

[10] Cf. Anacreon fr. 1. For the existence of games already before the rearrangements of the late 3rd cent. Rigsby, *Asylia* [n. 1], 189 n. 5, is persuasive. Xenophon calls the shrine of Artemis 'very holy' (*Hell*. 3. 2. 19); cf. the dedication of a bronze statue of Artemis Leukophryene on the Athenian acropolis by the sons of Themistocles (Paus. 1. 26. 4). An earlier source for the shrine is furnished by *OGIS* 229. 84, with D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (2 vols.; Princeton, 1950), ii. 894.

[11] 'Denn Artemis Leukophryene steht so ganz im Mittelpunkt des magnetischen Cultus und Gemeinwesens, daß von ihr beginnen muß, wer in Magnesia heimisch zu werden wünscht. Alle anderen magnetischen Culte, alle Feste, verblassen vor dem Glanz, der von ihrer Religion ausgeht' (Kern, 'Magnetische Studien' [n. 4], 491).

[12] Xen., *Hell*. 3. 2. 19, 4. 8. 17.

[13] The archaeological and architectural dating is disputed; in addition to the considerations mentioned above (n. 7), further epigraphic observations, stylistic criteria, and, connected therewith, the chronology of the architect Hermogenes play a significant role. For an early dating (in the context of the institution of the new festival) see esp. Kern, 'Magnetische Studien' [n. 4], 496 ff.; Magie, '*Roman Rule in Asia Minor* [n. 10], ii. 894–5; Ebert, 'Zur Stiftungsurkunde der *Λευκοφρυηνά*' [n. 1], 201–2, 211, 216. For a late dating (after 150) see esp. A. Yaylalı, *Der Fries des Artemisions von Magnesia am Mäander* (*IM* suppl. 15; Berlin, 1976), 106 ff.; in recent years the earlier hypothesis has been most widely accepted (see J. J. Coulton, *The Architectural Development of the Greek Stoa* (Oxford, 1976), 253; W. Hoepfner, 'Bauten und Bedeutung des Hermogenes', in Hoepfner and Schwander (eds.), *Hermogenes und die hochhellenistiche Architektur* [n. 8], 1–34 at 18, 29–30; M. Kreeb, 'Hermogenes: Quellen- und Datierungsprobleme', ibid. 103–13 at 103 ff.; N. Stampolides, 'Hermogenes, sein Werk und seine Schule vom Ende des 3. bis zum Ende des 1. Jhs. v. Chr.', ibid. 115–21 at 116 ff.; F. Rumscheid, *Untersuchungen zur kleinasiatischen Bauornamentik des Hellenismus* (2 vols.; Mainz, 1994), i. 25 ff.; cf. also M. Donderer, *Die Architekten der späten römischen Republik und der Kaiserzeit* (Erlangen, 1996), 34 n. 94), in combination with the assumption of a relatively long period of building.

inent architect Hermogenes,[14] arose on the site of the preceding building, directly next to the agora and architecturally connected with it.[15] This was the third largest temple in Asia Minor, after the temple of Artemis at Ephesus, one of the Seven Wonders of the World, and that of Apollo at Didyma.[16] To this was added a monumental altar for sacrifices.[17] In the cultic festivals, and especially in the agonistic festival of Leukophryena which took place every four years (first in 207),[18] the citizens and numerous guests who were present celebrated this connection between deity and city with sacrifice, sport, and play. The identity of the polis as henceforth 'sacred city'[19] was thus ritually confirmed.

The enhancement of the cult, undertaken on the basis of the divine apparition and the oracle, legitimated the especial engagement of the citizens: hellenistic rulers, among them the kings of the three great empires, Antiochus III, Ptolemy IV, and Philip V, as well as the Greek poleis and federal states, were approached. Groups of ambassadors,[20] and therefore members of the ruling class, about fifty of whom are known to us by name, travelled for months from early in the year 208,[21] usually in groups of three and divided by regions, through the whole Greek world, in the west at least as far as Sicily and in the east at least as far as the Persian Gulf, to at-

[14] Vitruvius 7, *praef.* 12; on the construction see especially J. Kohte, 'Die Bauwerke', in C. Humann (ed.), *Magnesia am Mäander: Bericht über die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen der Jahre 1891–1893* (Berlin, 1904), 9–172 at 9 ff.; Hoepfner, 'Bauten und Bedeutung des Hermogenes' [n. 13], 8 ff.; Bingöl, 'Zu den neueren Forschungen in Magnesia' [n. 8], 64 ff.; on representations on coins from the imperial period see S. Schultz, *Die Münzprägung von Magnesia am Mäander in der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Hildesheim and New York, 1975), 44–5; on the cult symbol 36–7; R. Fleischer, *Artemis von Ephesos und verwandte Kultstatuen aus Anatolien und Syrien* (Leiden, 1973), 140 ff., and 'Artemis Leukophryene', *LIMC* ii/1. 764–5, cf. N. F. Jones, 'The Autonomous Wreathed Tetradrachms of Magnesia on Maeander', *ANSMusN* 24 (1979), 63–109 at 91.

[15] Kohte, 'Die Bauwerke' [n. 14], 163; Hoepfner, 'Bauten und Bedeutung des Hermogenes' [n. 13], 18.

[16] Strabo 14. 1. 40.

[17] On this see Kohte, 'Die Bauwerke' [n. 14], 91 ff.; C. Watzinger, 'Die Bildwerke', in Humann (ed.), *Magnesia am Mäander* [n. 14], 173–228 at 175 ff.; Kern, 'Magnetische Studien' [n. 4], 494, 512; W. Hoepfner, 'Zu den großen Altären von Magnesia und Pergamon', *AA* (1989), 601–34 at 603 ff.; id., 'Bauten und Bedeutung des Hermogenes' [n. 13], 16–17 (with new reconstruction).

[18] Ebert, 'Zur Stiftungsurkunde der *Λευκοφρυηνά*' [n. 1], 207–8, 216.

[19] Cf. *IvM* 16. 4 (partially restored).

[20] Kern, 'Magnetische Studien' [n. 4], 500 ff.; on their influence on the bringing about of the foreign decrees see R. Laqueur, *Epigraphische Untersuchungen zu den griechischen Volksbeschlüssen* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1927), 32 ff.

[21] Rigsby, *Asylia* [n. 1], 181.

tain recognition of the new cultic festival and the sacred truce. The arguments they employed on each occasion are instructive for us. They mentioned the oracle first and foremost, but referred also to the general uprightness and piety of the Magnesians and appealed to the corresponding feelings and attitudes of the other Greeks. At the same time, however, they gave prominence to the connections of friendship and kinship which tied them to their addressees.[22] Thus, myth and history came into play.

In order to demonstrate their connections, the Magnesians engaged in considerable intellectual efforts. Poets and collections of oracles were cited, resolutions by other Greek states honouring them were brought forward and in part fabricated.[23] In this way, a web of historical interconnections and obligations materialized. At the head of these stood the official foundation myth of the city, which was also later inscribed on stone.[24] This revealed the high antiquity of the city and enabled the oldest connections of kinship[25] and friendship to other Greek tribes and poleis to be deduced. The remaining documents and sources elucidate the various services of the Magnesians to the Greeks as a whole[26] and to the individual cities,[27] as well as the honours that were the result. This was important because, according to Greek norms, services to others, so-called 'good deeds' (*εὐεργεσίαι*), established, confirmed, and underpinned a firm reciprocal bond: reciprocal help was the foundation of soli-

[22] See esp. *IvM* 16. 33 ff.

[23] *IvM* 46. 13–14 (Magnesian local historian); *IvM* 35. 9; 36. 9; 44. 14–15; 46. 13 (poets); *IvM* 34. 14; 35. 8–9; 36. 9; 46. 13 (collections of oracles); *IvM* 20 (fabricated); 65; 35. 9–10; 36. 9–10; 44. 15–16; 46. 14 ff. On the 'documentation' see esp. Kern, 'Magnetische Studien' [n. 4], 510–11.

[24] *IvM* 17 (=*FGrHist* 482 F 3); F. Prinz, *Gründungsmythen und Sagenchronologie* (Munich, 1979), testimonium 92; cf. O. Kern, *Die Gründungsgeschichte von Magnesia am Maiandros* (Berlin, 1894).

[25] On *συγγένεια* and its semantic field see D. Musti, 'Sull'idea di *συγγένεια* in iscrizioni greche', *ASNP* 32 (1963), 225–39, who, however, tends to underestimate the phenomenon. See further P. Herrmann, 'Die Selbstdarstellung der hellenistischen Stadt', in *Acts of the Eighth Epigraphical Congress* (Athens, 1984), 108–19 at 114 ff., and now above all O. Curty, *Les Parentés légendaires entre cités grecques* (Geneva, 1995), with important qualifications by A. Giovannini in his review at *MH* 54 (1997), 158–62.

[26] *IvM* 25. 9–10; 31. 13–14; 32. 15–16; 34. 9–10; 35. 7–8; 36. 15; 38. 12–13; 39. 13 ff.; 43. 14–15; 47. 13–14; 48. 7–8; 53. 19–20; 54. 12–13; 58. 12–13; 61. 12–13; 62. 9–10; 63. 12–13; 73b. 6–7; 86. 15; 85. 6–7. On the markedly panhellenic orientation of the Magnesians see Kern, 'Magnetische Studien' [n. 4], 508.

[27] Often with elements of generality: *IvM* 35. 20–1; 36. 7–8; 44. 12 ff.; 45. 21 ff.; 46. 8 ff., 27–8; 61. 12–13, 14 ff., 36–7, 65; 85. 16.

darity and loyalty between friends and relatives, which constituted an absolute obligation; and a good deed had to be reciprocated under all circumstances.[28]

In this field, the Magnesians had much to boast of. In accordance with their foundation myth,[29] and even though they spoke Ionic dialect, they traced their ancestry back to the Thessalian tribe of the Magnetes.[30] Via the fictitious eponym of this tribe, Magnes, they were related to Cephalus, the eponymous hero of the four cities on the island of Cephallenia,[31] but also to Macedon, the *ἀρχηγετής* of the Macedonians; this, incidentally, guaranteed them the support of the powerful King Philip V.[32] Now since the Thessalians collectively traced their ancestry back to Aeolus, one of the sons of Hellen, the Magnesians also stood in a close ancestral relationship with all the Aeolians, i.e. with the members of one of the three major tribal divisions of the Greeks.[33] As everybody knew, the Magnetes had taken part in the Trojan war, *the* big event of ancient Greek history. On their homeward voyage they were cast up on Crete and lived there for decades in a city called Magnesia, in very close association with the neighbouring Cretans. From there they departed, on the strength of oracles from Delphi, for their wealthy habitation on the Maeander, led by a Greek *οἰκιστής* from Asia Minor, Leucippus, and actively supported by the Cretans. They were the first Greeks to settle in Asia Minor. For this reason they could be of help to the Greeks who migrated there later: Ionians, Dorians, and Aeolians, the latter related to the Magnesians themselves.[34] This

[28] See in general H.-J. Gehrke, 'Die Griechen und die Rache', *Saeculum*, 38 (1987), 121–49 at 131–2; recently the phenomenon of reciprocity has been given more prominence—cf. e.g. S. von Reden, *Exchange in Ancient Greece* (London, 1995), esp. 18 ff.

[29] Cf. n. 24 above. We rely on Prinz's astute reconstruction of the connections: *Gründungsmythen und Sagenchronologie* [n. 24], 111 ff. (on the 'new' *κτίσις* see 130 ff.).

[30] Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* [n. 10], ii. 894; Dušanić, 'The *κτίσις Μαγνησίας*' [n. 2], 30; cf. Kern, 'Magnetische Studien' [n. 24], 17.

[31] *IvM* 35. 13–14, 18–19.

[32] *IvM* 47. 3–4.

[33] See esp. *IG* ii². 1091 = *OGIS* 503. 3 ff.; cf. Strabo 14. 1. 39 (*πόλις Αἰολίς*).

[34] This emerges with all the clarity one could hope for from a panhellenic decree from the time of Antoninus Pius (*IG* ii². 1091 = *OGIS* 503), i.e. from an era when the cultivation of the past held great importance. Everything suggests that the argumentation of the Magnesians at the end of the 3rd cent. BC is reflected here. In this connection it is worth recalling that a battle of Greeks against Amazons (amazonomachy) is represented on the frieze of the great temple of Artemis (see esp. Yaylalı, *Der Fries der Artemisions von Magnesia am Mäander* [n. 13]). Such a battle is not actually attested for the mythical history of the Magnesians. But a

above all was the conspicuous service on behalf of all the Greeks which they repeatedly mentioned, since the above-named tribes, as the descendants of Hellen, effectively represented the totality of the Hellenes. Later, the Magnesians took part in the successful defence of the central shrine at Delphi against marauding Celts—likewise a service of panhellenic dimensions.[35] Now, this service was historical even by our standards; it is datable to the year 279.[36] To this could be added relief services for individual Greek poleis, which were acknowledged by other Greeks too, such as the contribution to the foundation of the Arcadian city of Megalopolis (*c.*370/69)[37] and in the not very distant past a peaceful settlement during an internal struggle on Crete.[38] Some cities which had been newly founded in the late fourth century or in the third, Antiocheia in the Persis and Antiocheia in Pisidia (?), emphasized the participation of the Magnesians in their colonization.[39]

Time and again the Magnesians stressed that already 'from the time of their ancestors',[40] i.e. from the beginning, they had fulfilled their obligations of kinship and friendship both in individual cases and to the Hellenes as a collective whole. It was for precisely this reason that the appeal to ancient times, that which we understand by 'myth', was important. However, they continued the account of their conduct through the more recent past and into the present. This was calculated to give the impression of permanence. What the inscriptions have to offer us here is for the most part easily

representation of this kind, at least in the case of the one at Athens (on which see below), had a very precise connotation, namely that of the struggle of the Greeks *qua* moderation and order against barbaric savagery, which was considered alien. It is quite possible that this communicative content, released from its original context, was generalized and therefore 'readable' as such in Magnesia too.

[35] *IvM* 46. 9–10, cf. 35. 20–1; 36. 7–8; 44. 12 ff.; 45. 21 ff. The memory of this event was cultivated in no small measure by the institution of a cult for Zeus Soter, the Soteria (cf. n. 36). This had a markedly panhellenic component.

[36] G. Nachtergael, *Les Galates en Grèce et le Sôtéria de Delphes* (Brussels, 1977), fundamental.

[37] *IvM* 38. 22 ff.

[38] *IvM* 46. 10 ff., 65, cf. also 67 and *IvM* testimonia LIV (from Hierapytna); on the dating cf. Dušanić, 'The *κτίσις Μαγνησίας*' [n. 2], 20, and Rigsby, *Asylia* [n. 1], 181.

[39] *IvM* 61. 14 ff.; Strabo 12. 8. 14 with *IvM* 79–80; cf. esp. Rigsby, *Asylia* [n. 1], 260, 272; on the foundation of Antiocheia in the Persis see J. Wiesehöfer, *Die 'dunklen Jahrhunderte' der Persis* (Munich, 1994), 61–2 (with further bibliography); on the geographical identification cf. n. 45 below.

[40] Cf., *inter alia*, *IvM* 16. 34–5; 36. 6, 9.

recognized as a construct.[41] Thus, the story that the Magnesians derived from the Thessalian Magnetes, the cornerstone of their argumentation with regard to kinship ties, was simply spun out of the similarity of the names. The Cretan city Magnesia was, as it seems, an artistic creation of Plato in his treatise on the laws.[42] And the Magnesians themselves fabricated the resolution of the Cretan *κωνόν*, by which Cretan support in the definitive acquisition of land was authenticated, and, using all the tricks of the trade, equipped it with pseudo-precise wording and date.[43] But this was not at issue in the least. For all this counted as 'history' and was not open to any doubt at all.

Nothing demonstrates this more clearly than the fact that the Greeks who were approached accepted everything without question, indeed they all expressed and conducted themselves exactly as the Magnesians would have wished. This was not only a display of rhetoric, but was also bound up with not entirely insignificant financial consequences. The response was overwhelmingly positive. At least four rulers, Attalus I of Pergamum as well as those already mentioned, emphatically supported the request of the Magnesians and influenced accordingly the cities within their spheres of control.[44] Moreover, it emerges from the surviving inscriptions that at least 151 Greek poleis and federal states, from Syracuse in the west to Antiocheia in Persia (quite possibly on the Persian Gulf),[45] complied with the Magnesians' request.[46] Their resolutions,[47] which constitute the bulk of our dossier, demonstrate above all that they followed the Magnesians' argumentation

[41] Thus esp. Prinz, *Gründungsmythen und Sagenchronologie* [n. 24], 112 ff.

[42] Plato, *Laws* 4, 704 B–C; 8, 848 D; 9, 860 E (with scholia); 11, 919 D; 12, 969 A; cf. Prinz, *Gründungsmythen und Sagenchronologie* [n. 24], 125. G. R. Morrow, *Plato's Cretan City: A Historical Interpretation of the* Laws (Princeton, 1960), 30–1, is more inclined to accept 'historicity', but concedes that to date there are no archaeological indications thereof, and puts his hopes in the 'archaeologist's spade'. Even if there had existed in Plato's time an insignificant place of the same name on Crete, it only acquired its 'historical' meaning through Plato's work. This work is therefore presupposed by the event's becoming known, and thus by its incorporation in the foundation myth.

[43] *IvM* 20.

[44] *IvM* 18; 19; 22; 23; 47. 1 ff.

[45] On the possible geographical identification cf. the references in Wiesehöfer, *Die 'dunklen Jahrhunderte' der Persis* [n. 39], 86 n. 180, 101 n. 1; Rigsby, *Asylia* [n. 1], 259.

[46] In 189 the Romans too acknowledged the *ἀσυλία*: Tac. *Ann.* 3. 62. 1 with Rigsby, *Asylia* [n. 1], 180; the course of the debate is admittedly lost to us.

[47] On their formal structure cf. Laqueur, *Epigraphische Untersuchungen* [n. 20], 32 ff., and A. Chaniotis, 'Empfängerformular und Urkundenfälschung', in R. G.

at all points, operating with exactly the same presuppositions and thought-patterns.

A corollary to this is that these resolutions, which were generally made by the relevant assembly of the people, confirm what the Magnesian ambassadors had conveyed. They fully acknowledged the outstanding piety of the Magnesians and accepted their testimony to kinship and friendship[48] and to their services for the Greeks.[49] They too stressed the reciprocity of the obligations. And they too regarded the state of affairs as permanent. Myth and history had the same status; from the point of view of the addressees too, what was said had endured 'since the time of their ancestors',[50] indeed the aspect of permanence was given further emphasis, in particular through the affirmation that the acceptance of the Magnesian festival should hold 'for ever and ever'.[51] This was frequently supported by special measures: the resolution regarding Artemis Leukophryene was included among the most important laws of the state and published as an inscription at a prominent place in the city, usually the central shrine; often the resolution was also openly

Khoury (ed.), *Urkunden und Urkundenformular im klassischen Altertum und in den orientalischen Kulturen* (Heidelberg, 1999), 51–69.

[48] The key terms are *συγγένεια* (kinship; cf. n. 25 above)—less commonly *ὁμογένεια* (common origin)—*οἰκειότης* (familiarity), and *φιλία* (friendship), with their corresponding adjectives. All three occur together at *IvM* 65. 9, 17 ff. (Gortyn on Crete); 80. 12 (Antiocheia, probably in Pisidia), kinship together with *οἰκειότης* or *φιλία* at 33. 5, 15, 32 ff. (Gonnos and Phalanna in Thessaly); 35. 13–14, 18–19 (Cephallenia); 38. 20–1, 29 ff., 52 (Arcadia); 43. 23–4? (Messene, restored); 46. 3–4, 21–2, 25 (Epidamnos); 52. 17, 24 (Lesbos; Rigsby, *Asylia* [n. 1], 241, refers to the legendary founder of Mytilene, Macar, brother of Magnes: *HH Apollo* 37; Paus. 6. 21. 11); 58. 1–2 (unknown city, partly restored); 61. 11–12, 34–5, 42 (Antiocheia in Persia); 64. 20 (unknown city); 72. 22 (Syracuse); kinship alone occurs at 26. 25 (Thessaly); 70. 2 (a Cretan city); 79. 15, 21 (unknown city); *οἰκειότης* and *φιλία* occur, together or singly, at 31. 10 ff., 24, 36–7 (Acarnania); 32. 1–2, 4–5, 20 ff., 32 (Epirus); 34. 2–3, 6–7, 16–17 (Phocis); 36. 3–4 (Ithaca); 37. 7–8, 13–14, 21–2 (Athens); 39. 43 (Achaea, Elis); 41. 3 ff. (Sicyon); 42. 5–6 (Corinth); 43. 4 ff. (Messene); 48. 2–3, 6–7, 13–14 (Eretria, Hestiaea); 49. 3 (unknown city); 50. 9, 27 (Paros and other Aegean islands); 53. 11 (Clazomenae?); 55. 2 (Rhodes); 56. 3–4, 23 (Cnidos); 57. 2 (Cos?); 63. 21 (unknown city); 73b. 5, 10–11 (unknown city); 85. 3, 13 (Tralleis, with surrounding area); 87. 5 (unknown city in the Attalid kingdom).

[49] See n. 26 above.

[50] Or 'since ancient times' (*ἐκ παλαιῶν χρόνων*, e.g. *IvM* 38. 22; 85. 13) *vel sim.* (53. 22–3, 47 ff.; 57. 22 ff.).

[51] We often meet verbs from the semantic field of 'preserving', 'maintaining', such as *διαφυλάσσειν*, (*δια*)*τηρεῖν*, *διατελεῖν* (e.g. 37. 21–2; 48. 13–14; 52. 24; 61. 20–1; 62. 24–5; 63. 20–1) or a formula such as 'for all time' (*εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον*) (e.g. 31. 38 ff.; 50. 36).

proclaimed during the most important festival of the relevant city.[52] The memory of the affair was abundantly guaranteed.[53] And a desire to participate regularly in future festivals for Artemis of Magnesia was generally affirmed.[54] The cultivation of the memory of the Magnesians' services and of the good connections of friendship and kinship was thus to be guaranteed not only in the individual cities. It was also demonstrated regularly every four years at the Leukophryena and thereby ritually corroborated anew on each occasion. The Magnesian ambassadors generally received the highest honours which a community could bestow on foreigners. Consequently, there were also influential persons who as a result of their individual obligations and connections were intent upon the international relations that had now come into force or been affirmed, and who on the strength of their standing guaranteed the continued existence of those relations.

There was thus no question that the relationships which were founded on and confirmed by reciprocal services were established for the long term. They were exemplified in a stretch of past time which, by our standards, united myth, history, and current affairs in a single continuum, representing a tradition to which the present was committed and by which clear predictions about future conduct could be made. Mythical and historical events and characters were embedded in a hard and fast connection of traditions, whose effectiveness was guaranteed by the cultivation of memory. In the above-mentioned connections collective identity finds particular expression, with all its complexity. Greekness, that is to say hellenic identity, forms a natural field of reference, in that one counted services as services to oneself too, if they were performed for other Greeks, and especially if they benefited the totality of the Greeks. It is as if one were talking about a large family. Within it there are internal divisions, especially those by tribes (Ionians, Dorians, Aeolians) and by other criteria of kinship. In the absence of a common origin as the bonding factor, connections of friendship and neighbourly contact provided an equivalent which for the Greeks hardly counted for less. Spatial proximity also played a role, especially in

[52] Cf. e.g. 32. 33 ff.; 44. 35.

[53] *IvM* 34. 16f.; 38. 29 ff.; 53. 62 ff. (with particularly telling formulation); 62. 21 ff.

[54] *IvM* 35. 11, 25; 36. 18; 37. 8; 38. 31–2; 39. 28; 40. 15; 42. 8; 43. 16; 44. 17, 19–20; 46. 21–2; 48. 19; 50. 34; 52. 28; 53. 8; 54. 23; 55. 20, 24; 57. 27; 58. 32, 61, 56; 66. 5–6; 68. 1; 70. 15–16; 72. 6, 19; 73. 18; 81. 3; 86. 15; 87. 19.

the regional distribution of the groups of ambassadors. Even the natives of Asia Minor were integrated into the web of connections, in the form of the colonist Leucippus, who stood for the areas of Caria and Lycia and was at the same time of Greek descent, by virtue of his ancestor Bellerophon.[55] Just as the Greeks moved in a religious world that was acknowledged on all sides, so we encounter them here in an internally highly structured and interconnected space of past time that was common to all, a bundle of inclusive identities which merged in the exclusive identity of the Hellenes (as opposed to the barbarian Other).[56]

II

The wide resonance of the Magnesians' initiative and the marked correspondences in the references and in the structures of argumentation between their appeals and the answers they received show very clearly that we are dealing with quite ordinary, indeed typical, phenomena. They were widespread in the Greek world, and examples could be multiplied. Ubiquitous and especially characteristic was the precise and loving arrangement of a space in which the things we call myth and history met. Everywhere we run into a zone of past time which is not separated in principle from the present. In it reigns the same logic and necessity of relations and behaviour as in the present; obligations reach out from it through the present and into the future. The picture which the Greeks had, collectively and in their individual communities, of themselves and of their history, and in which diverse networks of relationships were imaginatively painted, had enormous significance for their understanding of themselves, their categorization of themselves and foreigners. It was an essential factor for the collective identity of the

[55] On Leucippus see above all Parthenius, *Mythographi Graeci*, ii. 1. 5 (=Prinz, *Gründungsmythen und Sagenchronologie* [n. 24], testimonium 86); he counted as the son of the Carian Xanthius and at the same time as a descendant of the famous Bellerophon, son of Glaucus, grandson of Sisyphus, who came to Lycia from his native Corinth and there became the ancestor of the Lycian royal dynasty.

[56] The figure of Leucippus and its integration into the Magnesian foundation myth clarifies that this Other could be relativized. The strict polarity which according to Lévi-Strauss shapes the structure of myth and which enjoys prima facie plausibility (thus G. S. Kirk, *The Nature of Greek Myths* (Harmondsworth, 1974), 80 ff.) does not here govern the whole system of thought.

Greeks and the definition of the Other. I have proposed the term 'intentional history' for this aspect of myth as history, or the amalgamation of myth and history.[57] By this I understand 'intentional' in the ethnosociological sense, as it was conceived especially by Wilhelm Mühlmann. The light which this can throw on historical research too was demonstrated some time ago by Reinhard Wenskus in his great work on the Germanic tribes during the period of migrations.[58] 'Intentional' in this sense denotes the elements of subjective and conscious self-categorization as belonging to a particular group, ethnic or of other sort. This self-categorization, relevant to group identity, was regularly projected back into the past. Thus, even if it was very young, indeed invented, it seemed to be given by tradition and was a fixed part of the *mémoire collective*. In this respect one can describe such a picture of the past as intentional, avoiding terms which imply value judgements, such as 'forgery', 'fictive history', or 'believed history'.[59] Intentional history would then be history in a group's own understanding, especially in so far as it is significant for the make-up and identity of the group; or, alternatively, tradition has a 'social surface' in the sense of modern social anthropology, it relates itself to a group which holds it as real.

It is characteristic of the Greek understanding of history that it was principally produced and transmitted by poets and historians, and, incidentally, that the latter saw and used the former as sources. Among the historians themselves there were always differences of goal and method. From the sixth century on there developed with Hecataeus, Herodotus, and Thucydides a scientific historiography. This was created by a drive to explore (ἱστορίη) and a philosophical search for the truth, by critical analysis and authorial self-consciousness. It was often related to identity, e.g. in its preoccupation with genealogies and ancestral relationships. It never excluded the world of myth and saga on principle. It did criticize or rationalize utterances whose character was too mythical, glorious,

[57] On this and what follows see especially H.-J. Gehrke, 'Mythos, Geschichte, Politik—antik und modern', *Saeculum*, 45 (1994), 239–64.

[58] R. Wenskus, *Stammesbildung und Verfassung: Das Werden der frühmittelalterlichen* gentes (Cologne and Graz, 1961); Gehrke, 'Mythos, Geschichte, Politik' [n. 57], 247.

[59] On the problems posed by such terms for antiquity see Ch. Gill and T. P. Wiseman (eds.), *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World* (Exeter, 1993).

and poetic, or μυθώδης,[60] or suppress them because the chances of their being verified were too small. Nevertheless, such events as the Trojan war or the legendary migrations of relatively large groups and tribes—some of them, as in the case of the Magnetes, spun out of the epic *Nostoi*—always counted as historical.

The connection between myth and history was much closer in those authors who formed what we might call the mainstream tradition of Greek historiography. In the second century AD Lucian still attacks the widespread pursuit of exaggeration and poetic embellishment in this genre, as well as its subjectivity and partisanship.[61] As a matter of fact, it was often less a matter of accurate research and the critical search for the truth than one of tendentiousness and effects. The border separating this from what we would call literary display was fuzzy, especially after the rhetoricization of historiography in the wake of Isocrates, and after the development of the 'tragic historiography' so characteristic of the hellenistic world.[62] It remained true that the portrayal of past events and situations, particularly of those belonging to myth, was also and originally the province of poets and artists. And since myth and history were not categorically separated in this domain, intentional history was also fed by the imagination of poets. Something which was invented by the tragedian Euripides, for example, could be taken as a fact of history. This was particularly effective because poets were invested with virtually prophetic powers.[63] We come across the same phenomenon in other genres too: the philosopher Plato was fond of dressing up important insights in the garb of myths, and occasionally, as in the Atlantis myth, gave these an air of authenticity by means of pseudo-precise details. But such constructs could be taken as historical facts; one might think of the above-mentioned foundation of Magnesia on Crete. In the extremely effective genre

[60] Cf. S. Flory, 'The Meaning of τὸ μὴ μυθώδες (1. 22. 4) and the Usefulness of Thucydides' *History*', *CJ* 85, (1990), 193–208; on this one can hardly base (with G. Rispoli, *Lo spazio del verisimile: Il racconto, la storia e il mito* (Naples, 1988), 39–40) a separation of μῦθος and ἱστορία in Thucydides.

[61] Cf. Gehrke, 'Mythos, Geschichte, Politik' [n. 57], 253–4.

[62] On the influence of rhetoric see now A. J. Woodman, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography* (London and Sydney, 1988); on 'tragic historiography' see F. W. Walbank, *Polybius* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1972), 34 ff., and Rispoli, *Lo spazio del verisimile* [n. 60], 70–1, as well as the literature cited in Gehrke, 'Mythos, Geschichte, Politik' [n. 57], 254 n. 36.

[63] On this evaluation see C. Gill, 'Plato on Falsehood—Not Fiction', in Gill and Wiseman (eds.), *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World* [n. 59], 38–87 at 70 ff.

of rhetoric, too, historical argumentation and demonstration extended to myth as well as historical events in our sense. In general, in all the genres we have mentioned, an understanding of historical reality or truth was in operation which moved idiosyncratically between fiction and reality, and frequently abandoned factuality in favour of general or in a higher sense 'true' utterances. Something represented in this way could, however, then be taken as a factual occurrence.[64] And, not least, the Greeks were surrounded by a world of images in which they were confronted on all sides by mythical tableaux, which they could take to be a firm component of their history. In contemplating these motifs, in regularly receiving poetic works steeped in myth, especially at festivals,[65] and in listening to splendidly produced speeches, the Greeks exposed themselves again and again to this presentation of the past. What they could read in historians was not qualitatively different from this. Let us remember that the Magnesians were arguing with the works of poets and historians.

Now perceptions of exactly this kind were fundamental for the *imaginaire* of a community, a polis, a league, and indeed the hellenic world as a whole. They also had prescriptive value, and this gave them particular importance. One was located in a temporal continuum at the beginning of which stood events tied to a primeval world of sacred myth and to which one was none the less connected 'from ancestral times', i.e. from the times of heroes and sons of deities.[66] It was a venerable world, from which binding obligations could be derived;[67] and yet these obligations could be altered through sub-

[64] On this see the important contribution of M. Erler, '"Mythos und Historie": Die Atlantisgeschichte als Platons Antwort auf die Frage: "Wie und wozu Geschichtsschreibung?" und Aristoteles' Reaktion', in P. Neukam (ed.), *Vermächtnis und Herausforderung* (Munich, 1997), 80–100; cf. also Rispoli, *Lo spazio del verisimile* [n. 60]; Gill and Wiseman (eds.), *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World* [n. 59].

[65] On the early period, and on the role of panhellenic or national festivals in this connection, cf. K. Morgan, *Athletes and Oracles: The Transformation of Olympia and Delphi in the Eighth Century* BC (Cambridge, 1990); Ch. Ulf, 'Überlegungen zur Funktion überregionaler Feste im archaischen Griechenland', in W. Eder and K.-J. Hölkeskamp (eds.), *Volk und Verfassung im vorhellenistischen Griechenland* (Stuttgart, 1997), 113–32 (with further references); on the performance of relatively long poems in the context of a festival cf. E. L. Bowie, 'Early Greek Elegy, Symposium and Public Festival', *JHS* 106 (1986), 13–35.

[66] Clearly stressed by Kirk, *The Nature of Greek Myths* [n. 56], 101 ff., 111–12.

[67] On the situating and prescriptive function of myth cf. M. I. Finley, *The Use and Abuse of History: From the Myths of the Greeks to Lévi-Strauss, the Past Alive and the Present Illumines* (London, 1975), 13; J. Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis:*

sequent inventions. Every innovation, however, became another binding fact, as long as it was received, or 'believed'. Thus on the one hand the Greek conception of the past was relatively fixed; that which one found in authors generally acknowledged as authoritative, such as Homer and Hesiod, could hardly be swept under the carpet. On the other hand, however, it was highly flexible, since every author could, for whatever purpose, create new versions and variants, and these had a chance of becoming common property, at least in a polis, if they were accepted. Thus, even historical events and figures could become mythicized, or develop into myth, especially if they carried significance, ponderance, or fascination for the relevant community.[68] Only eight years after the battle of Salamis, the tragedian Aeschylus brought the events and above all their meaning on stage in his *Persians*, in a genre which actually took its subject-matter from myth. And the victors of the Persian wars were soon put on a level with the heroes, as is shown especially by the Athenian dedication for Marathon at Delphi.[69]

Athens, or more precisely the collective memory of the Athenians, provides altogether the best example for the state of affairs sketched here. For we know their intentional history very well, particularly from numerous tragedies and from funeral orations[70]

Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen (Munich, 1992), 66 ff.

[68] On this and what follows cf. Gehrke, 'Mythos, Geschichte, Politik' [n. 57], 248 ff.

[69] On the monument for Marathon see R. Krumeich, *Bildnisse griechischer Herrscher und Staatsmänner im 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (Munich, 1997), 93 ff.; Ch. Ioakimidou, *Die Statuenreihen griechischer Poleis und Bünde aus spätarchaischer und klassischer Zeit* (Munich, 1997), 66 ff.; in general cf. M. Flashar, 'Die Sieger von Marathon: Zwischen Mythos und Vorbildlichkeit', in id., H.-J. Gehrke, and E. Heinrich (eds.), *Retrospektive: Konzepte von Vergangenheit in der griechisch-römischen Antike* (Munich, 1996), 63–85. On the new Simonides papyrus in this connection see above all D. Boedeker, 'Heroizing History: Simonides' Elegy on Plataea: Narrative Elegy, Mythodic History', *ZPE* 107 (1995), 217–29, and ead., 'Heroic Historiography: Simonides and Herodotus on Plataea', *Arethusa*, 29/2 (1996), 223–45.

[70] Cf. H. Strasburger, 'Thukydides und die politische Selbstdarstellung der Athener', *Hermes*, 86 (1958), 17–40, repr. in H. Herter (ed.), *Thukydides* (Darmstadt, 1968), 498–530; N. Loraux, *L'Invention d'Athènes: Histoire de l'oraison funèbre dans la 'cité classique'* (Paris, 1981); Ch. Meier, *Die politische Kunst der griechischen Tragödie* (Munich, 1988); R. Thomas, *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens* (Cambridge, 1989), 16 ff.; B. Zimmermann, *Dithyrambos: Geschichte einer Gattung* (Göttingen, 1989), 35 ff.; id., *Die griechische Tragödie*, 2nd edn. (Zürich, 1992), 12 ff.; B. Wilke, 'De mortibus nihil nisi bene: Elaborierte Mündlichkeit in den attischen Grabreden', in H.-J. Gehrke and A. Möller (eds.), *Vergangenheit und*

delivered by prominent politicians to honour those fallen in battle, and also from many works of art.[71] Decisive for the development of this specific understanding of their history and of themselves was unquestionably the experience of the Persian wars, especially the fact that they had achieved a miraculous victory over the great power out of their own resources (at Marathon), and that at the definitive victory over the Persians (for the Athenians this was the battle of Salamis) they had played the decisive part, thanks to their strong fleet, and had thus performed a magnificent service for all the Greeks. Out of this there developed a particular self-image. The Athenians stood for the struggle for freedom against hubris and barbarity as protectors of the weak. If they played a dominant role in the Greek political world, as happened after the Persian wars, this was legitimate. But this understanding was also extended backwards: the autochthonous Athenians had always played this part. They had always fought as protectors of the weak against chaotic and barbarian powers, against Amazons and Centaurs, for order and freedom, exactly as their goddess Athena had fought together with the other gods against the raw strength of the Giants. This idea formed the self-image of the Athenians, it was the cornerstone of their Identity. The Persian wars, and especially the battle of Marathon, thus became a link in a chain, a component of a historical sequence which had prescriptive force for future conduct. The Athenians had repulsed the Amazons and the barbarian Thracians, they had protected the persecuted descendants of Heracles and helped the Argives after the expedition of the Seven against Thebes. The successful fight against the Persians was the crowning termination of a sequence.[72] So they, the Athenians, had always been, and so they were also to be in the future.

This understanding of themselves was not only historicized, but also ritually perpetuated and visualized: the above-mentioned events were the object of regular *memoria*. They formed a virtually canonical element in the funeral orations for the fallen, and during

Lebenswelt: Soziale Kommunikation, Traditionsbildung und historisches Bewußtsein (Tübingen, 1996), 235–55.

[71] On the world of images and its connection with memory see now H. Th. Grütter, 'Die Athenische Demokratie als Denkmal und Monument: Überlegungen zur politischen Ikonographie im 5. Jahrhundert', in Eder and Hölkeskamp (eds.), *Volk und Verfassung* [n. 65], 113–32, with further references.

[72] On this reconstruction see esp. H.-J. Gehrke, 'Marathon: Von Helden und Barbaren', in G. Krumeich and S. Brandt (eds.), *Schlachtenmythen*, forthcoming.

festivals too, especially the yearly Dionysia, numerous tragedies allowed the Athenians to take pleasure again and again in their glorious past. During debates in the assembly of the people, and before the people's court, speakers referred to this at every possible opportunity.[73] One also came across the charter myths and great events when contemplating the art that decorated monumental public buildings, especially temples. The key event, the victory over the Persians, was compressed into an image, enshrined in bronze:[74] during the 450s BC the great sculptor Phidias created a bronze statue of Athena of about 9 metres in height, with a base, in full armour. This was set up on the acropolis and was visible far and wide, the most important state monument of the Athenians. With her epithet Promachos, 'fighter in front', she provided a lasting reminder of the victory over the Persians, in which the victory of Marathon, which alone was achieved by Athenian hoplites, moved further and further into the foreground. Athena Promachos, concrete and incarnate, became a fixed symbol, which still figured on coins of the Roman imperial period. Her communicative content, victory over barbarians and action for the Greeks, for freedom and for civilization, became so well known that even hellenistic rulers and Roman emperors made use of her for propaganda purposes.[75] In late antiquity she was even invested with miraculous powers: she had prevented the attack of the Visigoths under Alaric.[76]

At any rate, the Athenians derived their self-awareness from such and similar symbols of memory. They were confronted by these in visual, acoustic, and literary form, by their constant presence in art and their regular repetition in cult, festival, and debate. They were thus cultivated particularly intensively and served the Athenians' self-assurance, i.e. they were a central element of their collective identity.

The essence of intentional history among the Greeks in gen-

[73] Cf. K. Jost, *Das Beispiel und Vorbild der Vorfahren bei den attischen Rednern und Geschichtsschreibern bis Demosthenes* (Paderborn, 1933), and the literature cited at n. 70 above.

[74] On what follows see esp. 'Marathon' [n. 72], with further references.

[75] And in an equivalent context: on the dedication of Attalus on the Acropolis see Paus. 1. 25. 1 (with references in Flashar, 'Die Sieger von Marathon', [n. 69], 82–3 n. 74); on the Persian war of Gordian III see *Chronica Minora*, 147 Mommsen; Aurelius Victor 27. 2 (with references in Gehrke, 'Marathon' [n. 72], n. 23).

[76] Zosimus 5. 6. 2.

eral, of which we have seen some representative examples, can be summed up as follows:[77] its purpose was first of all to provide a basis for questions of right and legal claims. In a case of conflict, especially of war—and such cases were frequent—it could serve to determine which party had put himself in the wrong by making the first attempt, i.e. had begun the injustice. The *locus classicus* is the proem of Herodotus, with its presentation of the widespread debate over responsibility for the Persian wars. In a case of legal claims, e.g. to a piece of land, references to one's original assets, such as the appeal to autochthony, were important. In both cases it was advisable to go as far back into the past as possible. For this reason myth, or what we would call the 'purely' mythical part of intentional history, acquired especial significance. And claims to power could in no small way be legitimated by tradition.[78]

A further purpose of this reference to the past was to categorize oneself as belonging to particular groups; this was relevant for people's collective identity and their relationship to others, their concept of the Other. In this there was a wide spectrum between affinity and heterogeneity. At least from the time of Hesiod in the seventh century BC, there was a suitable framework which provided a fixed standard of reference, was generally acknowledged, and was susceptible to augmentation. On the highest level was the division between Greeks and non-Greeks (who went under the initially non-judgemental, onomatopoeic term 'barbarians'). The Greeks themselves were clearly subdivided according to the sons of Hellen they were descended from, Dorus, Aeolus, or Xuthus/Ion.[79] Some groups, such as the Macedonians and, initially, our Magnetes, were not yet fully accepted as Greeks but did not count as barbarians because of their recognized affinities with the Greeks. These could be accounted for accordingly by being traced back not to one of Hellen's sons but to one of his nephews. They were thus cousins.[80] The scheme also continued within the polis, the fundamental political unit of the Greeks, in the form of the *φυλαί*. These were sub-

[77] Cf. esp. 'Mythos, Geschichte, Politik' [n. 57], 239 ff.

[78] On the reflection of questions of right and status in myth cf. E. R. Leach, *Political Systems of Highland Burma* (London, 1954), 278.

[79] Ch. Ulf, 'Griechische Ethnogenese versus Wanderungen von Stämmen und Stammstaaten', in id. (ed.), *Wege zur Genese griechischer Identität: Die Bedeutung der früharchaischen Zeit* (Berlin, 1996), 240–80 at 264 ff.

[80] Hesiod, *Catalogue of Women*, fr. 7 West.

divisions of tribes on the one hand, and of cities on the other. They thus guaranteed an inclusive identity. Membership of a polis was based on them, while the polis in turn, with its citizens, belonged to one of the traditional tribes deriving from Hellen. In other words, as a member of a polis one also belonged to one of the major subdivisions of the Greeks, and therefore possessed a Greek identity too.[81] As we have seen in the case of Magnesia, these relationships could form a quite concrete basis for argumentation. Examples to illustrate the political exploitation of these connections, and the obligations that resulted from this, could be abundantly multiplied.

This holds also for the handling of friendship and close familiarity (φιλία and οἰκειότης), in which reciprocally binding services and good deeds played an important role. Here too, the reference to intentional history, and with it to the special significance of myth, was central. For the omnipresent reference to the ancestors allowed evocation of an age-old tradition. References to their services brought in a mythico-historical sphere, in which concrete historical services could also be integrated into the *spatium mythicum*. The ancestors walked on the same level as the heroes.

In the handling of intentional history too, strong coincidences can be observed. It is clear that the utterances about kinship or unrelatedness depended to varying degrees on social proximity or distance, on awareness of easily observable similarities or differences. Here languages or dialects play a role, as do religious customs and practices, social practices and lifestyles, and views of history. But these elements formed as it were a full circle of reciprocal relations. One observation was interpreted and evaluated, and then shed light on other areas, strengthening and transforming them: because one was aware of certain similarities in specific domains, one carried these over to other domains and transformed them. This operated in language, religion, ways of life, and political conduct, leading to intrumentalization and a tendency to standardize in these domains (one might think of the strong politicization of Ionianism and Dorianism in the Peloponnesian war, but also of Ionic music and Doric temples), and formed the basis for a now artificially moulded identity, which was, however, no longer perceived as artificial but accepted as fact. It was imperative that memory of these

[81] D. Roussel, *Tribu et cité: Étude sur les groupes sociaux dans les cités grecques aux époques archaïques et classiques* (Paris, 1976); Ulf, 'Griechische Ethnogenese' [n. 79], 264 ff.

facts was continually renewed, in ritual, in literature and the writing of history, and in art. In this connection, one often spoke of 'renewal' (*ἀνανεώσασθαι*).[82]

All this held also, as we have already indicated, for creative accretions. New facts, whether historical in our sense or not, could always be integrated into the reservoir of intentional history. In this way, intentional history could be continually altered and rewritten, depending on current experiences and needs. It was only necessary that such creations should also be seen as mythico-historical events. And this was often the case. The cultivation of memory thus involved not only the preservation of certain facts and the selective forgetting[83] of others, but also the invention of illusory facts and their transmission as factual events. What was new could at any time be taken into the stock of memory and thus become and remain relevant for concepts of identity. In other words, aetiological fiction became transmitted memory. To sum up, history was not infrequently written with the present as starting-point, but *qua* history it confronted the present with all the signs of religious sanctity and hoary antiquity, with traditional ties of kinship and friendship and resulting obligations.[84]

[82] In our Magnesian example, see *IvM* 17. 43; 31. 12; 36; 32. 5; 21; 33. 14; 34. 6; 37. 13; 41. 3; 42. 5; 48. 5; 61. 34.

[83] There is not space to go into this important factor here. One may, however, point to indications which are provided, once again, by the case of Magnesia: there existed there an (older) variant of the story of the Magnesians' origins, according to which Magnesia had been colonized from Delphi, so that the Magnesians were descendants of the Delphians (Strabo 14. 1. 40, cf. Prinz, *Gründungsmythen und Sagenchronolgie* [n. 24], 112 ff., with further references). This variant was apparently current for a long time and had a concrete relevance (Prinz, 119). Yet by the end of the 3rd cent. it had ceased to play any role in the argumentation of the Magnesians, even with respect to Delphi: in the resolution of the Delphians in response to Magnesia (Rigsby, *Asylia* [n. 1], no. 79. 4) there is talk of intimate friendship, but not of kinship. The new version was apparently more important to the Magnesians—and also influential at Delphi. Thus it is probable that the old 'fact' disappeared from public consciousness. The learned could unearth it, to be sure (Strabo, loc. cit.), since it had already been fixed in writing by others. This shows where the limits of forgetting lie—and lay already in antiquity. For the 'forgotten' version could at any time be resuscitated from learned literature or poetry. A similar phenomenon could also lie behind the Spartan descent of the Magnesians that is reported by Velleius (1. 4. 1). But this is speculative and can also be explained in other ways (see e.g. Prinz, 135, with various possible solutions).

[84] Cf. in general Kirk, *The Nature of Greek Myth* [n. 56], 60, with reference to the concept of 'charter myths' in B. Malinowski, *Magic, Science and Religion* (Garden City, NY, 1954).

III

The observations and considerations sketched so far can be correlated very well with recent and ground-breaking ethnological and sociological theories of collective identity. In his copious and systematizing book on 'the magical universe of identity' Klaus E. Müller has stressed the fundamental importance of kinship and common origin for the constitution of ethnic groups.[85] The 'strongest bond' (69) in such groups therefore lies in blood relationship, and thence follows the special significance of the 'lineage', i.e. of those who trace their origin to common ancestors (67). Blood relationship also governs or defines the delimitation of a group *vis-à-vis* others. According to the 'standard of kinship',[86] there are closer group identities (lineages, clans, families) and broader ones (tribes), with corresponding rules for endo- and exogamy.[87] The concepts of kinship find their way into or are translated into common language, religion, and customs, i.e. into the prevailing culture. These factors are felt to be communal and are handed down as such (89 ff.). At the same time kinship is further solidified in a very concrete way (91 ff.), e.g. through the establishment of relationships of 'quasi-kinship' (93), such as marriage and adoption in all their variety of manifestations. And kinship is projected into the past, into a mythical 'history' (94 ff.). This is as long a stretch of time as possible, so that as a rule the earliest ancestor is the 'first human' (95). This person stands in great proximity to the gods. It is particularly significant that kinship does not necessarily depend on a true blood relationship, but only on starting from one, believing in one, or assuming one. We can say that this kinship is not a biological but a cultural entity, even if it makes use of the physical

[85] K. E. Müller, *Das magische Universum der Identität: Elementarformen sozialen Verhaltens* (Frankfurt and New York, 1987).

[86] Ibid. 85; on the role of kinship see also esp. G. Simmel, *Soziologie: Untersuchungen über die Formen der Vergesellschaftung* (Leipzig, 1908), here quoted from G. Simmel, *Gesamtausgabe*, ed. O. Rammstedt, xi (Frankfurt, 1992), 563 ff.; G. Vowinckel, *Verwandtschaft, Freundschaft und die Gesellschaft der Fremden: Grundlagen menschlichen Zusammenlebens* (Darmstadt, 1995), 66 ff.

[87] Relics of such components still seem to have existed at least in the Cretan *φυλαί* in the 5th cent. BC: see H.-J. Gehrke, 'Gewalt und Gesetz: Die soziale und politische Ordnung Kretas in der Archaischen und Klassischen Zeit', *Klio* 79 (1997), 23–68 with n. 59.

facts. In the face of currently widespread sociobiological theories, this point needs to be insisted upon.[88]

Also particularly instructive are the considerations proposed by Peter L. Berger's and Thomas Luckmann's sociology of knowledge, especially in their book *The Social Construction of Reality*, first published in 1966 and often reprinted thereafter.[89] Embedded in this is also a theory of identity, indebted to the conception of the *Lebenswelt* of Husserl's pupil Alfred Schütz and the social psychology of George Herbert Mead, but more broadly based on a wide sociological and anthropological foundation. The starting-point is what Berger and Luckmann understand by 'construction'. According to this, identity is ultimately a construct, namely the result of manifold, and in individual cases often no longer easily comprehensible, social—and, I would add, historical—structures, which can weave a dense web. As a rule they are tied to specific perceptions and observations of difference and similarity. These can be physically determined, but the decisive factor is that they are strongly interpreted and evaluated, arranged, and (trans)formed. Fundamental elements are 'constructed' in this sense. But this is no longer perceived at all, for their genesis, which is often neither conscious nor directed at a specific goal, is no longer remembered. Most importantly, they appear to be objective entities. In the words of Berger and Luckmann, they are reified, they count as factually given, indeed as natural,[90] they are firm components of the social store of knowledge and have a 'social surface'. As such, they are objects of social communication and tradition, that is to say, they are passed on both synchronically and diachronically. In socialization, that is to say in the development of individual identity in the framework of collective identity, they are significant for the self-categorization of individuals as well as groups (20, 194–5).

History, or what a given society regards as its history, also belongs to this kind of social knowledge. One could also say that the social store of knowledge about the past is what I call intentional history. But this kind of history has a great deal to do with concrete be-

[88] Cf. also Vowinckel, *Verwandtschaft, Freundschaft und die Gesellschaft der Fremden* [n. 86], 19 ff., 73 ff.

[89] Citations are from the Penguin edition: P. L. Berger and Th. Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge* (London, 1991).

[90] Ibid. 85–6, 106 ff.; cf. Vowinckel, *Verwandtschaft, Freundschaft und die Gesellschaft der Fremden* [n. 86], 8 ff.

haviour, it is a component of 'recipe knowledge' (82–3). It is always capable of being built up or extended, no surprising fact given its very genesis in a creative and constructive process. One could—and can—'tinker with' this history (181–2), according to one's interests, and yet ultimately create facts and lay down realities, even by the bare and ostensibly neutral reporting of information.[91] Since the forgetting of events, states of affairs, and relationships, once they have come into the store of knowledge, is usually difficult, the task of intentional history here consists above all of falsification and fiction, i.e. in the invention of facts. Access to this management of the historical store of knowledge is particularly associated with political power (137). However, one must not forget here that the created past needs to be confirmed and perpetuated in order to enter the social store of knowledge for good. In other words, there is need for recollection in a socially acceptable form. Meanwhile, as we have already noted, the original concrete occasion that had caused the creative revision of the past could pass from memory. Should this happen, however, this sort of history becomes a component of a stereotypical world of symbols, alongside, in particular, language and religion.[92] Thus history in self-awareness is sedimented (85). It is particularly relevant and effective for identity when it has been integrated into the mythical-religious conception of the world.

IV

The striking correspondences between these broadly based and theoretically well-grounded ethno-sociological analyses and our historical observations suggest the hypothesis that we are dealing here with socio-anthropological constants. Empirical observation of history shows these turning up in a multitude of different variants, but they have certain structural points in common. Further research must follow up this relationship between constants and variables, demarcate them one against the other, and enquire into the specific

[91] This is particularly underlined in modern discursive psychology, in an ethnomethodologic context; see J. Potter and M. Wetherell, *Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour* (London, 1987), 183, and D. Edwards and J. Potter, *Discursive Psychology* (London, 1992), 127, with examples on pp. 30 ff. The principle can easily be extended to historiographic narrative.

[92] In the sense of Durckheim; see Berger and Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality* [n. 89], 85 ff., 129–30, 177–8.

causes and prerequisites of individual cases. This can only happen in a larger interdisciplinary field of research. Nevertheless, there is still progress to be made by the historian in this domain, namely to investigate the influence which the individual variants have exerted on one another. For behind the structural correspondences could lie direct connections and appropriations, which further strengthen what is already in common.[93] In this connection I would like in conclusion to point to certain fields in which the ancient exempla have continued to have effect, i.e. in which the structural similarities have been strengthened by conscious recollection.

With regard to the post-antique renaissances of European history, we must notice from the start that self-definition and self-assurance have in modern times been consciously trained and developed on ancient models. There are in fact numerous examples of appropriation of antiquity in this sense. The search for one's particular, and in this case ancient, ancestors was consistently normative in character and contributed to identity, initially in communication with other discourses of identity,[94] ultimately in the increasingly exclusive and demarcative concept of nationalism[95] and in the differentiation between west and east. Here again the categories of antiquity and kinship were and are of central importance. Given this, the retrospective appropriation of antiquity with its already normative value was a natural development. In antiquity, one found one's ancestors and founding heroes. And with that, history tended to become myth.

As a concrete example, let us now turn to the interpretation of the Persian wars, exemplified by the battle of Marathon. These wars were built up into an event of great significance for the history of the western world. This was prepared by the interpretation of the authors who counted as classical, especially Herodotus. One saw behind the events of the war a fundamental conflict between Greeks and barbarians, freedom and despotism, moderation and excess. Later on, the dialectic was extended from this starting-point, keeping its association with pairs of opposites such as civili-

[93] On this complex cf. Kirk, *The Nature of Greek Myths* [n. 56], 79–80.

[94] This is investigated by Dieter Mertens in the Freiburg interdisciplinary research group.

[95] This is the object of Joseph Jurt's, Gerd Krumeich's, and Erich Pelzer's investigation in the interdisciplinary research group.

zation and barbarity, occident and orient.[96] A dictum of John Stuart Mills expresses this succinctly. For him, 'the Battle of Marathon, even as an event in English history, is more important than the battle of Hastings. If the issue of that day had been different, the Britons and the Saxons might still have been wandering in the woods.' The Greeks were thus adopted, along with one of their central battle myths, as a part of our own history, as if they in their time had already fought for western civilization. This identification went together with a marked exclusion and demarcation, as becomes exceedingly clear in Hegel's *Philosophie der Geschichte*: 'Das Interesse der Weltgeschichte hat hier auf der Waagschale gelegen. Es standen gegeneinander der orientalische Despotismus, also eine unter einem Herrn vereinigte Welt, und auf der anderen Seite geteilte und an Umfang und Mitteln geringe Staaten, welche aber von freier Individualität belebt waren.'[97] Accordingly, the Greek victories were 'welthistorische Siege: sie haben die Bildung und die Geistige Macht gerettet und dem asiatischen Prinzipe alle Kraft entzogen'.[98] This figure of memory, based on opposition, has also influenced the modern science and understanding of history.[99] Its dichotomy encouraged the same exclusion in tradition, in the forgetting or selective awareness of history. Classical antiquity was the dominant point of reference. Beside it, other civilizations, including the oriental ones, and not least the Jewish one, were to a large extent cut out. Only in quite recent times do we begin to hear voices in ancient history which call for and achieve adequate attention to these strands of tradition.

[96] On what follows cf. Flashar, 'Die Sieger von Marathon' [n. 69], 74 ff.; Gehrke, 'Marathon' [n. 72], with references.

[97] 'The interest of world history here lay in the balance. There stood against one another oriental despotism on one side, that is to say a world united under one leader, and on the other side discrete states of moderate territory and resources, but animated by free individuality.'

[98] 'Victories of worldwide historic relevance: they rescued culture and spiritual power and took away from the Asiatic principle all of its strength.'

[99] Cf. the references in A. Demandt, *Ungeschehene Geschichte* (Göttingen, 1984), 59. In an article from 1991 one can still read: 'In der Tat fand bei Marathon der erste "Frontdurchbruch" der jungen athenischen Demokratie statt. Damit fing eine zivilisatorische Epoche an, die den Charakter von Griechenland als eines Wegweisers für Europa entscheidend geformt hat' ('In fact, at Marathon the first breakthrough of the young Athenian democracy took place. That was the beginning of an epoch for civilization, one that definitively marked out Greece as a signpost for Europe'): I. Kertész, 'Schlacht und "Lauf" bei Marathon: Legende und Wirklichkeit', *Nikephoros*, 4 (1991), 155–60 at 158–9.

Now, if western civilization traces itself back to classical antiquity, this is even more true of the Greeks themselves. For the Greeks could see their ancestors in the ancient Greeks in a very elementary, virtually physical, sense. Even today, they speak quite uninhibitedly of *πρόγονοί μας* ('our ancestors').[100] No academic is as unpopular in Greece today as the Tyrolese Jacob Philipp Fallmerayer, who made them into the descendants of Slavic immigrants, thus as it were degrading them. Here again the best example is furnished by the reception of an event which was already in antiquity a central element of intentional history. In addition, it shows how archaeology as well as ancient history is exploited. Already in the nineteenth century a large funerary mound, the *σωρός*, was identified and excavated on the plain of Marathon. Since then, it has counted as the grave of the 192 Athenians who fell at Marathon, who were venerated as heroes already in antiquity. The military dictatorship adorned it with additional trappings and made it into a modern memorial for heroes, at which the renown of the Greeks and their brave armed forces could be celebrated again and again, with parades and appeals.[101] This was the cultivation of memory in exactly the sense—albeit in different forms—in which we have established it for antiquity. At this point we cannot pass over the fact that in 1995 a young archaeologist published an article in which she offers arguments worthy of consideration against the identification of this mound with that of the fallen Athenians.[102] But let us not laugh too soon: as is well known, the memorial to Arminius does not stand at the right spot either.

But the heroes of Marathon and Arminius the Cheruscian are merely individual examples of a quite normal phenomenon of modern nationalism, one to which increasing attention has been paid in recent years. Eric J. Hobsbawm's book *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*, which appeared in 1990, might be mentioned as a representative sample of the interest in this field. It is anything but an accident that at precisely this point in time academic research is taking up this theme with increased vigour. For we are at present witnessing a revival of nationalism.

[100] On the reception of the Marathon myth in the modern Greek world cf. the references in Flashar, 'Die Sieger von Marathon' [n. 69], 75.

[101] Ibid. 77 with n. 103.

[102] A. Mersch, 'Archäologischer Kommentar zu den "Gräbern der Athener und Plataier" in der Marathonia', *Klio*, 77 (1995), 55–64.

George Bush, then president of the United States, expressed this clearly in a speech before the full assembly of the United Nations on 23 September 1991, not without a glance at identity and history: 'People who for years had been denied their pasts have begun searching for their own identities. . . . This revival of history ushers in a new era.'[103] We all know how much conflict and bloodshed has arisen and can arise from this search for identity. For this reason, we should not restrict our task as historians to studying the variant forms of this search. We should also clarify the consequences of the selective one-sidedness of collective memory, expose what has been created and distorted, and bring to light what has been forgotten. In this way, we offer an informative corrective to the impressive images and symbols of intentional history. Where history becomes myth, historical research must stand up and speak, urgently and emphatically. To cite once more an American president (John F. Kennedy), 'The great enemy of truth is often not lie—thought-out, invented, and false—but myth—steady, convincing, and unrealistic.'[104]

[103] Cited after P. Cartledge, *The Greeks: A Portrait of Self and Others* (Oxford and New York, 1993), epigraph.

[104] Cited after *Die Zeit*, 51/37 (5 Sept. 1997), 1.

15

Herodotus and Oral History Reconsidered

OSWYN MURRAY

The first version of 'Herodotus and Oral History' was written in 1977, a quarter of a century ago, for the great series of seminars which I ran with Arnaldo Momigliano while he was a Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford. At the time I was composing *Early Greece* (1980), and seeking to justify the use I was to make of Herodotus, not merely as a source, but also more importantly as a more or less sympathetic interpreter of archaic Greece. The problem was not only the extent to which he was an accurate recorder of the events which occurred, and how this accuracy was achieved, but also whether his interpretation of the structure of the archaic world view could be accepted. Did he understand the events he described, or was his description only partial and distorted? These were genuine and traditional historical questions, only slightly touched by the new historiography.

In the context of the seventies the original title of the essay was also deliberately polemical: it was an attempt to build on Momigliano's observation that, not only Herodotus, but Greek historiography in general is essentially oral and contemporary, and so fundamentally opposed to our conception of history.[1] The claim that Herodotus should be viewed as a historian related to orality was meant to be taken in at least three different ways. First, it was a claim that the *sources* of Herodotus were largely oral, not written, sources, and his approach to them should be understood in the terms currently being used by the new schools of anthropology and contemporary oral history, rather than as a problem in nineteenth-

[1] Cf. Luraghi in the introduction to this volume, pp. 8–9.

century literary 'source criticism'. Second, I was convinced that Herodotus was essentially an *oral performer*, whose written text represented merely a final stage in the composition and recording of his ideas.

Third, these interpretations were directly inspired by the great debate of the sixties, between orality and literacy. I have written elsewhere of the liberation from the tyranny of literary studies experienced by the generation of the sixties;[2] literature was a prison imposed on us by a culture that had forgotten spontaneity. The revelation of Marshall Mcluhan had been that the medium was indeed the message: we could return to a world where poetry was performed, not written, and regain the spontaneity of preliterate societies through performance art. Archaic and classical Greece became a cultural ideal to be interpreted by adventurous thinkers like E. R. Dodds and E. A. Havelock, or by anthropologists like Jack Goody and Ian Watt. We read Mcluhan and Marcuse, Luria and R. D. Laing, and listened to the Beat poets and the Liverpool sound. In that sense this essay belonged to the generation of the *soixantehuitards*: 1968 remains as important in the definition of the culture of the twentieth century as 1848 in the previous century. The first section of the paper was, then, a deliberate attempt to make a splash in a small backwater, to change the nature of Herodotean studies, and to replace the image of the literate library researcher of German classical scholarship with a new model of Herodotus as an early anthropologist.

Ten years later the unpublished paper was related to another of the preoccupations that I had inherited from Momigliano, the problem of alterity, the extent to which Herodotus could understand an alien culture. Much has been written about this in recent years.[3] The example of Persia was chosen not simply because the second section was composed for the occasion of a conference in the series run by the Achaemenid History Workshop of Groningen, but more because Persia was the most important of the civilizations Herodotus had attempted to describe, and because so much recent

[2] 'The Word is Mightier than the Pen', *TLS* (16–22 June 1989), 655–6.

[3] See esp. Edith Hall, *Inventing the Barbarian* (Oxford, 1989); also my remarks in 'Pierre Vidal-Naquet et le métier d'historien de la Grèce: l'"école de Paris"', in François Hartog, Pauline Schmitt, and Alain Schnapp (eds.), *Pierre Vidal-Naquet, un historien dans la cité* (Paris, 1998), 154–66.

work had already been done on other cultures such as Egypt and Scythia.

It is gratifying to see that this time-bound essay can still provoke so much discussion among a younger generation. The reader has already experienced the extent to which the contributors to the original conference in Turin, and subsequently to this volume, agree or disagree with my earlier assertions, which are now part of history. But since the author is still alive he has been permitted a conclusion, in which I shall attempt to indicate the extent to which the discussion which started so long ago remains for me still fruitful, and the directions in which I now think it should be moving.[4]

There are many aspects of the original essay which seem to me to have retained their importance, although not all have become generally accepted: some have been rejected, while others are obviously still controversial.

Let me start from the question of Herodotus' sources. In one sense the criticisms that have been made against the original article are justified. While asserting that his sources were oral, I was still working with a basic model related to the principles of source criticism, as indeed was Vansina in his first book *Oral Tradition*. We were in a way still searching for a methodology to discover 'the truth' which lay somehow at the start of the chain of oral transmission. But this positivist aim was tempered by a contrary realization that the factual truth no longer mattered in the reconstruction of the chain of testimonies. Accuracy of transmission was the real criterion for the reliability of an oral tradition; and most conditions which promoted accuracy of transmission were either indifferent to the truth or falsity of a story, or acted positively on tradition in such a way as to distort the truth. Thus the old preoccupation of source criticism in uncovering bias or *Tendenz* in order to discover the truth was replaced by the realization that distortion itself could act as a guarantee of the accurate transmission of traditions, and that we must therefore abandon our obsession with the historical value of oral traditions. The non-existence of professional remembrancers in Greece[5] implied that Greek oral tradition lacked the fixity of many other societies, and was therefore open to more varied types of distortion. I nevertheless argued that the search

[4] I shall confine myself to the first part of the paper, leaving observations derived from a visit to Iran in 1998 for another occasion.

[5] Cf. Luraghi, p. 157.

for the origins of particular stories was still possible, by means of close attention to the 'deformation' that they seemed to have undergone: the key to Herodotean source criticism thus became part of a wider enterprise to discover the different types of oral tradition that had existed in Greece. I believed that it was possible to establish broad categories, and to attribute them to particular communities or groups. Thus family traditions seem to have been especially important for Herodotus' narrative of Athenian events, while Spartan stories centre around the values of a hoplite polis. Moralizing elements seem to be especially associated with stories whose details suggest a probable Delphic origin. I have since argued that the Herodotean tradition about Corinth in its first stage (Cypselus) is created out of typical orientalizing folk motifs; whereas the story of Periander is more closely related to characteristically Greek mythic obsessions with the dysfunctional family.[6]

These attempts to identify the traditions belonging to particular groups should be related to more recent attempts by Jan Assmann and others to classify historical traditions in terms of a collective memory. I confess that I had not then read Maurice Halbwachs (nor it seems had Vansina), but his insights would certainly have deepened our analyses. However, although both are social phenomena, there is I think an important difference between the idea of the *collective memory* of a composite culture and the hypothesis that within that culture there might exist individualized *group memories* at least partially independent of the collective memory. Both forms of cultural memory are determined by the functional needs that the process of memory serves for the receiving generation; but it may be that group memories are more fixed and more resistant to manipulation simply because they are the property of a relatively closed group. At least it seems generally agreed that for oral traditions the social conditions for transmission are determinative, and it is the functional analysis of social memory which is important: what purpose does each memory serve in the present? Moreover, social knowledge about the past is not transmitted in the same way or for the same reasons in all cultures; and what is remarkable about the range of Herodotus' use of traditions is the complexity of types of transmission as exemplified in his narrative. We need therefore to be aware of the differences between different traditions

[6] 'Falaride tra mito e storia', in L. Braccesi and E. De Miro (eds.), *Agrigento e la Sicilia greca* (Rome, 1992), 47–60.

on the one hand, and on the other we should be careful not to interpret these differences as directly related to particular sources: in Luraghi's brilliant formulation even Herodotus' statements about his 'sources' should be seen as metaphors, not as metonymies (Jacoby), let alone as direct source attributions (Fehling). In my original formulation of these problems, I was certainly guilty of interpreting all differences between different traditions as disguised indications of Herodotus' sources.

Where Herodotus himself belongs in relation to the groups whose traditions he recorded remains to me obscure. He was certainly not the innocent eye, but rather a very self-conscious manipulator of the stories he reports. Did he belong within a group which had traditionally preserved information and did he therefore inherit these manipulative skills? If so, I originally suggested on the basis of the traditions preserved about Ionia that this group was itself perhaps East Greek: Herodotus would then belong to the end of a particular regional tradition. In any event his own deformations are not to be interpreted politically, but as a function of his literary personality: they are related both to his method and to his sources. So I imagined Herodotus as 'heir to a tradition of oral *logopoioi*, storytellers, who transcended his forerunners by moulding into a unity the traditional tales of his art, and ensured its disappearance by collecting and writing them down in relation to a new and greater theme—the last and greatest of the *logopoioi* by virtue of being a *logographos*'. As Luraghi points out (p. 11), not only does this view postulate an Ionian storytelling tradition for which no direct evidence exists; it also offers 'a new version of Herodotus' splendid isolation created by Jacoby'. But if my hypothesis is abandoned, there will remain the problem of placing Herodotus in a context within the oral tradition, of reducing his isolation as a *πρῶτος εὑρετής*. His *Histories* was certainly 'a work based on oral tradition, rather than simply composed using oral sources' (Luraghi, p. 1); but I still suspect that in its generic composition it was also oral.

It is this problem that has ensured that the question of written influences on Herodotus will not disappear. It is clear that such influences exist in particular sections, and different scholars will attribute to them more or less emphasis: my own insistence on documentary models only in connection with the information on Persian military and satrapal organisation was perhaps excessively minimalist. However, most of the contributors to this volume seem

to be agreed on the relative unimportance of fixed texts such as laws or ritual texts; and Bertelli rightly emphasizes the absence in early Greece of epigraphic chronicles (p. 71). Robert Fowler, while claiming a 'surprising number of written sources', nevertheless asserts that 'his main sources were oral' (p. 99); and both Bertelli and Fowler agree that writing was a necessary condition for the development of history, rather than a full explanation of its invention. I remain unconvinced by the attempts of scholars such as Drews and Fowler to assert the origins of historiography in local chronicle and the substantive dependence of Herodotus on allegedly earlier local historians: for me, Jacoby's refutation of that view still stands. More plausible might be the claims for important influence from earlier writings on genealogy (Bertelli, Fowler); and yet Herodotus is remarkably sparing in his use of genealogies, despite the fact that the only certain book he actually cites is Hecataeus' *Genealogies* (6. 137).

In this context it is worth emphasizing the continuing importance of Jacoby both for me and for all other participants in this volume, whether as point of reference or as focus for disagreement. For better or for worse we cannot escape that inheritance, which continues to dominate whether negatively or positively the way that we approach the problem of Herodotus. No other modern scholar has had a comparable effect in determining the development and structure of studies on Herodotus and indeed the whole history of early Greek historical writing. It would be a true revolution if we could be persuaded to cease from either repeating or contradicting the views of Jacoby; but I remain sceptical whether that is yet possible.

Herodotean chronology belongs to this traditional set of questions, and it is fascinating to see the impact that modern study of oral traditions has had on it. The claim of many anthropologists that the limit of accurate information in oral tradition is normally three generations certainly fails to account for Herodotus' ability to range over twice that time-span, or the fact that (as I pointed out in my article) 'information about the earlier part of his period is only quantitatively, not qualitatively, different from his information about the later part. . . . his account of the career of Polycrates is not intrinsically more or less historical than the story of Cypselus and Periander at the limit of his knowledge' (pp. 20–1).

More interesting still is the apparent absence of evidence for the

phenomenon of the 'floating gap' in Herodotus, which Rosalind Thomas points out. Herodotus simply makes no effort to relate his limit of five or six generations to any previous period of origins or even to the heroic age. Did Herodotus abandon the older mythical times deliberately on methodological grounds, as Fowler believes? That at least is consonant with Hesiod's doctrine of the five ages, which clearly separates off the age of heroes from that of iron. This problem which is raised by Thomas is surely at least partially solved by Vannicelli. The Greek version of the floating gap is for us identified with the historical period of the Dark Ages and the age of colonization, whereas for the Greeks it was a question of the relation between *spatium historicum* and *spatium mythicum*. Herodotus in his Greek narrative evades this (Fowler) or at least fails to confront it (Thomas). But he does in fact confront it in his attempts to create a relationship between Egyptian and Greek history, as Vannicelli demonstrates clearly. The failed enterprise of Herodotus to create from Egyptian chronology the framework for a universal chronology, and so to bridge the 'floating gap', is shown by Astrid Möller to be remarkably similar to the attempt of Hellanicus of Lesbos in the next generation to create a universal chronological framework from the list of the priestesses of Hera at Argos. Hellanicus was criticized mercilessly if obliquely by Thucydides both for inaccuracies in his Sicilian dates and for the fundamental problems of using even an annual, let alone a non-annual, list of names for dating purposes (particularly one which was based on priestesses, whose lifespan was inevitably longer than their male equivalents) (2. 2; 5. 20; 6. 1–5). Thucydides rightly saw the problem that even annual lists of magistrates were inaccurate for detailed military chronology and insufficiently panhellenic; but his own solution was limited to single periods of war, and the problem was only finally solved by Hippias of Elis with his panhellenic four-year cycle of Olympic victors. It seems to me that these essays represent a major advance in our understanding of the problems of the Herodotean 'longue durée'. But they also reveal yet again the marginal importance of chronology in the development of Herodotus' approach to history.

Recent work on Herodotus has been dominated by the contributions of Israeli scholars. The new Teubner text of Chaim Rosén (1987, 1997) offers much linguistic and textual clarification, while the Fondazione Valla edition of Herodotus by David Asheri and his Italian colleagues is the first detailed historical commentary for a

century: the completion shortly before his death of the commentary on the last two books represents a fitting memorial to the greatest Herodotean scholar of our generation; a revised English translation of the commentary is in preparation. This detailed historical work has demonstrated for the modern generation the extent of the factual basis of Herodotus' researches: the scepticism of scholars such as O. K. Armayor and Detlev Fehling has been decisively refuted. It is perhaps even a little disturbing to find Herodotus so clearly vindicated as a positivist historian; but that is an aspect of his work that we must live with, however we explain it.

More fundamental changes are visible in the development of recent work on oral tradition and the collective memory. Vansina's second book, *Oral Tradition as History* (London, 1985), complicated the insights of his first, but without invalidating them; for (unlike the first) it was not essentially a book about tradition at all, but rather about the uses of memory in an oral society and its relationship to the needs of western-style historiography.[7] Nevertheless, I would certainly rewrite many details of my account in the light of it, as well as welcoming such information as the fact that the oral tradition behind Herodotus' 'table of the sun' is still alive in the modern Sahara (p. 19 above: Herodotus 3. 18 ff.). There have been a number of more recent studies of oral tradition,[8] which have opened the possibility for a far more detailed and sympathetic study than was attempted in my original article, as well as raising the important methodological points which I have mentioned above. But despite the many merits of the new Herodotus commentary, the task of analysing the narrative of Herodotus in detail from the point of view of oral tradition remains.

In the meantime one new discovery has rightly revived interest in the literary antecedents of Herodotus. The new Simonides fragment on Plataea must surely cause us to re-evaluate all the scattered references to a poetic memorialist tradition contemporary

[7] It is very surprising that Assmann does not seem aware that this book is a different work from *Oral Tradition*: he seems not to have used the earlier work, despite its far greater importance for his theme.

[8] Notably M. T. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066–1307*, 2nd edn. (Oxford, 1993); David Henige, *Oral Historiography* (London, 1982); Rosalind Thomas, *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens* (Cambridge, 1989), and *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge, 1992); James Fentress and Chris Wickham, *The Social Memory* (Oxford, 1992); Jan Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen* (Munich, 1997).

with the Persian wars: as was already apparent from Aeschylus' *Persians*, before Herodotus there existed a variety of literary genres in which the conflict between Persia and Greece was celebrated. The poetic elements, especially in the last four books of his *Histories*, need to be investigated again in relation to this fact; and we need perhaps to recognize that Herodotus was not just the most Homeric of prose authors, but more generally the most poetic. The mistake that should be avoided is reducing this analysis to the search for verbal reminiscences; for it is clear that Herodotus did not seek to use poetic sources as evidence; rather he responded to poetry more obliquely, by employing and rejecting its narrative and dramatic techniques in order to make vivid his own narration of events.[9] It is, for instance, noticeable that the linguistic correspondences that have been detected with Aeschylus' *Persians* are found in Herodotus, not in the narrative, but only in the dramatic speeches attributed to his historical characters.

This is surely another sense in which Herodotus the enquirer cannot be separated from Herodotus the literary artist. His enquiries led him to consider evidence derived from other established literary genres as well as from Greek and foreign oral traditions. The need to create an artistic narrative for himself especially in the later books, often from traditions existing as disconnected memories not yet formed into λόγοι, caused him to reflect on and perfect his own techniques of λόγος-making. The narrative of the Persian wars themselves has too long been left as the preserve of the military historian; it is time for the student of narrative techniques to consider this story for what it is—the greatest continuous prose narrative in Greek literature, and a literary masterpiece. So in order to understand Herodotus we must cease to regard him as a historian, and see him as a narrator, whose narrative art is related to that of his sources. Herodotus should be accepted as the creator of a new generic form which only later became identified as history.[10]

Once again, however, we are faced with a Herodotus viewed in isolation: how can we contextualize him? It is clear enough from the example of Simonides that he does not belong in the world of

[9] See Deborah Boedeker, 'Heroic Historiography: Simonides and Herodotus on Plataea', *Arethusa*, 29/2 (1996), 223–42, repr. in D. Boedeker and D. Sider (eds.), *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire* (Oxford, 2001), 120–34; Edith Hall, *Aeschylus:* Persians (Warminster, 1996), introduction.

[10] Here lies, as Luraghi points out (p. 140), the proper reading of the work of Fehling.

the praise poets of the Persian wars, however much he is influenced by them, as Ewen Bowie argues. Nor is his world sympotic, as W. Rösler tentatively suggested.[11] Rosalind Thomas has argued persuasively that he belongs more firmly in the fifth-century Athenian and Ionian intellectual circles normally described as sophistic: his enquiries are polemical display pieces, his style of discourse possesses the 'agonistic persuasive and epideictic element I would also like to see as belonging to the milieu of "scientific" enquiry and the pursuit of truth about the world'.[12] As she implies, the place of performance is surely the lecture circuit, suitable for Thucydides' derogatory 'display piece for instant listening' (*ἀγώνισμα ἐς τὸ παραχρῆμα ἀκούειν*). But two cautions must be entered. The first is that, as Thomas herself recognizes, these aspects stand 'somewhat apart from the narrative', and the narrative is after all central to the understanding of Herodotus.[13] Second, as Fowler points out in this volume, the purpose of the composition of his written text is communication with all of the Greeks (above, p. 108). Within the text as it is preserved, there is a conflict between an imagined 'immediately present' audience of Herodotus, which is an audience here and now in this city (once perhaps physically present, now represented by the individual reader), and a wider audience, for whom the written text was composed, which is all of the Greeks. The problem is already present in Homer's *Odyssey*, where the bard is represented internally as singing always in a specific sympotic context (in Phaeacia, or among the suitors on Ithaca), but we simply cannot imagine where (if at all) the *Odyssey* as a whole was actually performed. This gap between an oral performance and a written text is interpreted by Fowler as implying performance of extracts from a written text; I would prefer to see it as a process related to the final stage of Herodotus' career, perhaps even to his migration to the west, where the whole story of the Persian wars was relatively unknown, and deeply disturbing because it highlighted the distance between those Greeks who had participated and those in the west who had failed or even refused to do so. Whatever we make of the two alternative readings of Herodotus's first sentence,

[11] 'Mnemosyne in the Symposion', in Oswyn Murray (ed.), *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposion* (Oxford, 1990), 230–7.

[12] Rosalind Thomas, *Herodotus in Context* (Cambridge, 2000), 282.

[13] She ends her stimulating book with the words 'We have not had space to deal with Herodotus' traditional tales, the *logoi* about earlier Greek society and the way he welded together the disparate sources and accounts of the Persian Wars' (p. 285).

there is a very important sense in which the version apparently attested by Aristotle, and therefore earlier, contains a fundamental truth: it was 'Herodotus of Thurii', not Halicarnassus, who was the first western Greek historian.

So far I have been discussing the search for a scientific origin for history, in chronology, in local historians, in critical enquiry. But like Aristotle, 'as I grow older I fall more and more in love with myth'. In the postmodern world we have learnt that there is no history without myth; the idea that we can get back to events is clearly false. As Wittgenstein said at the start of the *Tractatus*, 'Die Welt ist die Gesamtheit der Tatsachen nicht der Dinge'. History is about facts, not events, and facts are inevitably interpretations of events. This general shift in the consciousness of historians should lead to a re-evaluation of the uncertainties of oral history. Oral history is more ambiguous in the sense that it is less concerned with the idea of a single truth, but more concerned with possible multiple interpretations of events. Oral tradition is truer to the beliefs of the past (whether contemporary to the events or a later fifth-century past) precisely because it is more biased, more open to manipulation.

Moreover, there is even today a problem about the relation between history and myth. If, as Gehrke maintains, the writing of history is essentially a form of myth-making, it becomes the more attractive to see the origins of history in myth, in the traditional art of storytelling, rather than in any breakthrough in 'scientific' method. If modern history is the creation of useful myths for the present, then Herodotus is the father of history precisely because he is a teller of useful tales designed to explain the present condition of the Greek world. This was, after all, the conclusion of George Grote in 1846 in the famous sixteenth chapter of his *History of Greece*, entitled 'Grecian mythes, as understood, felt, and interpreted by the Greeks themselves'.

There are a number of senses in which this interpretation can be explored. The origin of historical writing may well lie in the progressive systematization of that peculiarly Greek form of myth, the charter myth: before Herodotus came the creation and systematic collection of *μῦθοι*.[14] Moreover, as Fowler points out, it is a charac-

[14] See 'History', in Jacques Brunschwig and Geoffrey Lloyd (eds.), *Greek Thought: A Guide to Classical Knowledge* (Cambridge, Mass., 2000), 328–37 (originally published in French translation as 'L'histoire', in *Le Savoir grec* (Paris, 1996), 368–78).

teristic of Greek mythography that it is 'occasion-free, panhellenic, and in these respects literate' (p. 113). Oral tradition is also close to myth in that both deal in stories and not in facts; within the oral tradition, facts do not exist for themselves: they are preserved only in so far as they are either useful to the present or incorporated in stories which are themselves the basic units, told for their own sake. The basic unit in Herodotus' oral traditions is not the fact, but the λόγος; and the λόγος is by definition a story with a shape, and therefore literary or at least proto-literary. But perhaps it would be wise to take this not as part of a theory or an argument, but simply as a way of reading Herodotus as a historian, recognizing him indeed as a fellow historian.

Notes on Contributors

Lucio Bertelli has been Professor of the History of Ancient Political Thought at the University of Turin since 1971. His research has concentrated on Greek Utopia, the phenomenology of Greek stasis, and the relationship between philosophy and political thought (Aristotle, Democritus, Speusippus, Dicaearchus). More recently he has worked on Attic comedy (Aristophanes) and early Greek historiography (Hecataeus, Aristophanes, and historical memory).

Wolfgang Blösel is Assistant Professor of Ancient History at the University of Greifswald. He has published articles on Polybius' sixth book, the concept of *mos maiorum* among the Romans, and the development of oligarchic constitutions in classical Greece. He is currently at work on a book on Herodotus.

Ewen Bowie is E. P. Warren Praelector in Classics at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and Reader in Classical Languages and Literature in the University of Oxford. He has made a number of contributions to the study of early Greek elegiac and iambic poetry, Attic comedy, and hellenistic poetry, but the majority of his work has been on the Greek literature and society of the high Roman Empire, where his articles have discussed the writing of many central authors (among them Pausanias, Philostratus, and Heliodorus) and addressed the place of sophistic rhetoric, prose-writing, and poetry in imperial Greek society as a whole. He is currently completing a commentary on Longus, *Daphnis and Chloe*.

Robert L. Fowler is Henry Overton Wills Professor of Greek at the University of Bristol. His *Early Greek Mythography* was published by Oxford University Press in 2000.

Hans-Joachim Gehrke is Professor of Ancient History at the Albert-Ludwigs-Universität, Freiburg. A pupil of Alfred Heuss, he has published extensively on the social history of Greece from the archaic to the hellenistic age. His publications include *Stasis: Untersuchungen zu den inneren Kriegen in den griechischen Staaten des 5. und 4. Jh. v. Chr.* (1985) and *Jenseits von Athen und Sparta: Das dritte Griechenland und seine Staatenwelt* (1986). He has also been the editor of *Rechtskodifizierung und soziale Normen im interkulturellen Vergleich* (1994) and the joint editor of *Vergangenheit und Lebenswelt: Soziale Kommunikation, Traditionsbildung und historisches Bewußtsein* (1996).

Maurizio Giangiulio is Professor of Greek History at the University of Trento. In addition to many articles on the social and cultural history of the Western Greeks, he is the author of *Ricerche su Crotone arcaica* (1989). Amongst his other publications are 'Le héros fondateur, l'éspace sacrée de la déesse: Notes sur Héraclès et les sanctuaries d'Héra du Peloponnèse à la Grande Grèce' (1996); 'Avventurieri, mercanti, coloni, mercenary: Mobilità umana e circolazione di risorse nel Mediterraneo arcaico', in S. Settis (ed.), *I Greci*, ii/1 (1996); 'Atene e l'area tirrenica in età periclea: Forme e ideologie di un rapporto', *Ostraka*, 6/2 (1997). His present research is devoted to the study of local traditions in archaic Greece, notably the processes of their construction and transmission.

Alan Griffiths is Senior Lecturer in Greek and Latin at University College London. He is the editor of *Stage Directions: Essays in Ancient Drama in Honour of E. W. Handley* (1995), and has also published in the areas of archaic and hellenistic poetry and Greek vase-painting; but his main field of interest is the typological study of Greek accounts of the mythical and historical past. He is preparing an edition of Herodotus book 3, and a book on Herodotean narrative, provisionally entitled *Herodotus His Stories*.

Nino Luraghi is Assistant Professor of Classics at Harvard University. He has worked mainly on Greek historiography and on archaic Greek tyranny. His publications include *Tirannidi arcaiche in Sicilia e Magna Grecia* (1994).

Astrid Möller held a research post at Freiburg University. She was a fellow at the Center for Hellenic Studies and recently spent one year at the Dipartimento di Scienze Storiche dell'Antichità of the Perugia University. She is the author of *Naukratis: Trade in Archaic Greece* (2000)

Oswyn Murray is Fellow and Tutor in Ancient History at Balliol College, Oxford, and Praefectus of Holywell Manor Graduate Centre. A pupil of Arnaldo Momigliano, he has worked mainly on the cultural and social history of archaic and classical Greece and on the history of classical scholarship. He has recently edited *The Greeks and Greek Civilization* (London, 1998), an English selection from Jacob Burckhardt's *Griechische Kulturgeschichte*. He currently directs the Bibliotheca Academica Translationum, an international research project on the diffusion of classical scholarship through translation within the European 'Republic of Letters' (1701–1917).

Roberto Nicolai is Professor of Greek Literature at the University of Sassari. He is the author of many contributions on Greek historical and geographical literature. In 1992 he published *La storiografia nell'educazione antica* (Biblioteca di materiali e discussioni, 10), and in 1998 he edited an Italian translation of Polybius. He has contributed to a handbook on Greek

literature by L. E. Rossi and has been a member of the editorial board of the *Enciclopedia oraziana*.

Rosalind Thomas is a Reader in Ancient History at Royal Holloway, University of London. She is the author of *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens* (1989), *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece* (1992), *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science, and the Arts of Persuasion* (2000), and of contributions on early Greek historiography and the relationship between literacy and Greek law.

Pietro Vannicelli is a Research Fellow at the Istituto per gli studi micenei ed egeo-anatolici of the CNR in Rome. He has published many contributions on Greek historiography and is the author of *Erodoto e la storia dell'alto e medio arcaismo* (1993).

Index Locorum

Acusilaus
2 T 1: 90 n. 72, 105
2 T 5: 73 n. 18, 90 n. 72
2 T 6: 73 n. 18, 90 n. 72
2 T 11: 105
2 F 2: 114 n. 34, 115
2 F 6: 105
2 F 23a: 90 n. 72
2 F 25: 114
2 F 43: 114
Aeschylus
Persians
65–76: 188 n. 39
Alcaeus
44 Voigt: 107
Alcmaeon
24 B 1: 80, 83 n. 46
Anaximander
12 A 1: 78 n. 28
12 A 7: 78 n. 28
12 A 9: 78 n. 28
12 B 1: 78 n. 28
Antiochus of Syracuse
555 F 10: 117 n. 4
Apollodorus
1. 8: 85 n. 53
1. 64: 85 n. 50
Archilochus
5 W: 52
88 W: 59, 60, 61
89–104 W: 61
89 W: 59
91 W: 59, 64
93a–101 W: 59
93a W: 59, 64
94 W: 57, 59, 64
95 W: 57
96 W: 64
98 W: 57, 59
101 W: 60, 64
102 W: 64
105 W: 60, 61
106–7 W: 61
106 W: 60
109 W: 60, 62
172–81 W: 51 n. 21
184–7 W: 51 n. 21
192 W: 51 n. 21
286–9 W: 51 n. 19
Aristophanes
Equites
1084–5: 189 n. 42
1134: 270
1331: 270
Nubes
859: 187 n. 34
Pax
1048: 188 n. 37
1070–2: 188 n. 37
1088–95: 188 n. 37
1119: 188 n. 37
Vespae
380: 189 n. 42
Aristotle
Politics
1266[a] ff.: 167
Athenaeus
13, 610 c: 53

Callimachus
Aetia
1. 9–12: 48
Charon of Lampsacus
262 T 1: 250 n. 39
262 F 1: 250 n. 43
Clement of Alexandria
Stromates
1. 21. 133: 126 n. 40
Cornelius Nepos
Miltiades
7: 192
Cratinus
fr. 62 Kassel–Austin: 189 n. 42
Cypria
fr. 1 Davies: 74

Dicaearchus
frr. 57–8 Wehrli: 219 n. 12
Diodorus Siculus
1. 5. 1: 253

Diodorus Siculus (*cont.*):
1. 26. 5: 242 n. 6
8. 17: 117 n. 4
8. 29: 126 n. 38
11. 27. 3: 193 n. 58
11. 54: 193 n. 58
Dionysius of Halicarnassus
De Thucydide
5: 23 n. 20, 70, 247 n. 29, 249 n. 38
9: 241 n. 1

Ephorus
70 F 63: 192
70 F 193: 187 nn. 34–5
Eugammon of Cyrene
fr. 3 Bernabé = 2 Davies: 123 n. 23
Eupolis
fr. 102 Kassel–Austin: 190 n. 44

Flavius Josephus
Contra Apionem
1. 12: 3 n. 2
1. 20: 72

Hecataeus
1 T 16: 79
1 F 1: 80, 101
1 F 13: 82 n. 39
1 F 15: 84
1 F 17: 89
1 F 18: 82 n. 39
1 F 19: 82 n. 39, 86, 101 n. 9
1 F 20: 88 n. 68
1 F 21: 81 n. 36, 89, 148 n. 27
1 F 25: 82 n. 39
1 F 26: 82 n. 39, 86 n. 58, 101 n. 9
1 F 27: 79 n. 31, 85, 86 n. 57, 101 n. 9
1 F 30: 79 n. 31, 86, 90
1 F 76: 86 n. 58
1 F 119: 89 n. 68
1 F 127: 87
1 F 300: 87 n. 60, 91
1 F 328b: 148 n. 27
Hellanicus
4 F 36: 256 n. 62
4 F 79b: 246, 248 n. 32
4 F 84: 246 n. 25, 248 n. 32
4 F 85a: 246
4 F 85b: 246
4 F 86: 246
4 F 169: 115
323a F 24: 199
Herodotus
1. 1–5: 65, 156 n. 45, 213
1. 1. 1: 156, 214
1. 5: 24
1. 6. 1: 274
1. 7–12: 43
1. 7. 4: 232
1. 14–22: 201
1. 20: 146
1. 27: 162–3, 201
1. 29–33: 180
1. 47. 1: 215
1. 48. 2: 163 n. 5
1. 53: 163
1. 56–8: 202 n. 5
1. 56–7: 270
1. 57: 160, 206
1. 65–7: 201
1. 65. 4: 202
1. 66. 4: 156
1. 67. 5–68: 150
1. 70: 204
1. 70. 2–3: 148
1. 73–4: 38
1. 73: 38
1. 78: 162
1. 91: 163
1. 95–130: 38
1. 95: 25
1. 95. 1: 155, 156 n. 45
1. 95. 2: 232
1. 102: 40
1. 119: 38
1. 129: 38
1. 140. 1: 156 n. 46
1. 141. 76: 201
1. 146: 202 n. 5
1. 171. 1: 145
1. 171. 3: 270
1. 196–9: 165–8
1. 214: 40
1. 214. 5: 155
2. 2–4: 212–13, 222
2. 2. 1: 218
2. 3. 1: 144 n. 20, 152, 214, 217
2. 3. 2: 215
2. 4. 1: 144 n. 20, 215–18, 221
2. 4. 3: 236–7
2. 5–35: 236
2. 6. 2–3: 237
2. 10: 239
2. 13. 1: 144 n. 20, 218, 222, 223,

225–7
2. 13. 2: 238
2. 15. 2–3: 212
2. 15. 2: 214, 215
2. 18. 1: 152
2. 19. 1: 144 n. 20
2. 20 ff.: 145
2. 28–34: 237, 239
2. 28. 1: 152
2. 28. 4: 215, 238
2. 29. 1: 145
2. 30: 238
2. 31: 238
2. 32 1–33. 2: 159
2. 32. 1: 147 n. 26
2. 34. 1: 146
2. 36. 1: 227 n. 28
2. 37. 2–5: 227 n. 28
2. 37. 5: 227
2. 38: 25
2. 43: 208, 216, 229
2. 43. 1: 218
2. 44. 1: 214
2. 45. 3: 228 n. 29, 229
2. 50–2: 202 n. 5
2. 50: 229
2. 50. 1: 216
2. 52–5: 151 n. 36
2. 52. 2–53. 3: 159
2. 55. 3: 159 n. 55
2. 61: 28
2. 77: 26
2. 77. 1: 152, 214, 215
2. 91. 3–5: 141
2. 99–100: 202
2. 99: 26, 219
2. 100–1: 207
2. 100. 1: 153, 207, 234
2. 101. 1: 203, 207, 220
2. 101. 2: 218
2. 102: 203
2. 104. 1: 152
2. 111. 1: 226
2. 111. 2: 225
2. 119. 3: 154
2. 112: 207, 225
2. 123. 1: 143, 219, 227 n. 28
2. 127. 1: 225, 226
2. 127. 3: 225
2. 129. 1: 226
2. 133. 3: 226
2. 134: 25
2. 134. 3: 91 n. 77
2. 137. 1: 225
2. 139. 3: 225
2. 142–3: 92, 240
2. 142–6: 220–1
2. 142: 26, 208
2. 142. 1: 92 n. 83, 93, 144 n. 20, 217, 220, 225
2. 142. 2: 221, 228
2. 142. 4: 216
2. 143–5: 207
2. 143: 25, 63, 84 n. 47, 87 n. 60, 91, 92, 207–8, 221, 257 n. 67
2. 143. 1: 154 n. 41
2. 143. 2: 92 n. 83
2. 143. 3: 225
2. 143. 4: 208, 228–9
2. 144: 215, 221, 228
2. 144. 1: 208
2. 145–6: 208
2. 145: 207–8, 230
2. 145. 1: 216
2. 145. 3: 153
2. 145. 4: 218, 223, 225, 232
2. 146: 208, 228 n. 29, 229
2. 147: 26
2. 147. 1: 144 n. 20, 146, 217, 238
2. 147. 2: 227 n. 28
2. 149: 218
2. 151 ff.: 203
2. 154: 26
2. 154. 4: 146 n. 24, 218, 238
2. 164–6: 227 n. 28
2. 164. 1: 227 n. 28
2. 168: 227 n. 28
2. 169. 4: 227 n. 28
2. 178: 28
3. 30: 39
3. 44–53: 204, 272
3. 47: 204
3. 48–9: 204
3. 53: 204
3. 55. 2: 150, 151 n. 36
3. 59. 4: 250 n. 43
3. 61–88: 39
3. 80–2: 142
3. 80: 65
3. 84–7: 43–4
3. 84: 41, 175
3. 87: 155
3. 89–97: 36
3. 103: 156
3. 105: 145
3. 117: 173–8

Herodotus (*cont.*):
3. 118: 174–6
3. 119. 1: 176
3. 122. 3: 270
3. 153–60: 39
4. 2: 168–73
4. 5–12: 231
4. 5: 203
4. 5. 1: 154, 214
4. 7: 203
4. 8: 86 n. 58
4. 14: 141
4. 16. 1: 154
4. 16. 2: 145
4. 20: 170
4. 25. 2: 154
4. 32: 145
4. 46. 1: 154, 214
4. 76. 5–6: 155
4. 77: 155
4. 78. 3: 138
4. 145: 124, 202 n. 5
4. 147. 1–2: 124
4. 147. 4–5: 124
4. 149. 1–2: 124
4. 150. 2: 128 n. 46
4. 150. 3: 125 n. 33, 126 n. 38
4. 151. 1: 125 n. 33, 126 n. 38
4. 152. 2–3: 129 n. 50
4. 154–6: 120–1
4. 155 ff.: 117 n. 4
4. 155. 1: 130 n. 53
4. 155. 2–3: 128 n. 48
4. 155. 3–156: 135
4. 155. 3: 125 n. 34, 126 n. 38, 130 n. 54
4. 155. 4: 125 n. 33
4. 156. 1: 125 n. 33, 126 n. 38
4. 157. 2: 125 n. 34, 130 n. 51, 130 n. 53
4. 159. 3: 125 n. 34, 130 n. 53
4. 161: 129 n. 50
4. 161. 2: 125 n. 33, 126 n. 38
4. 163. 2: 125 n. 35, 126 n. 38, 222 n. 18
4. 192. 3: 145
4. 203. 1: 125 n. 33
5. 21: 172
5. 22: 231
5. 22. 1–2: 204
5. 24. 1: 110
5. 26: 202 n. 5
5. 27: 89
5. 31. 2–3: 191 n. 53
5. 36: 25, 84 n. 47, 89, 94
5. 44: 148
5. 52–3: 36
5. 55: 274
5. 71: 202, 204
5. 78: 274
5. 81–9: 204
5. 82. 1: 204
5. 90. 2: 126 n. 39
5. 92: 201
5. 125: 25, 84 n. 47
6. 43: 142
6. 52–3: 201, 206
6. 52. 1: 156
6. 53–5: 230 n. 33
6. 53. 1: 147
6. 54: 231
6. 54. 1: 147
6. 56–60: 156
6. 105: 57
6. 125–7: 167–8
6. 127–9: 23
6. 132–6: 191
6. 136–40: 202 n. 5
6. 136. 2: 88, 192
6. 137: 87, 159, 319
7. 3: 172
7. 10: 32
7. 61–98: 36
7. 61. 1: 163 n. 3
7. 61. 3: 231
7. 94–5: 202 n. 5
7. 139–44: 189 n. 41
7. 139: 64
7. 139. 1: 197 n. 70
7. 139. 5: 195, 196 n. 69
7. 142. 2: 195 n. 64
7. 142. 3: 189
7. 143–4: 195 n. 64
7. 143. 3: 189
7. 150. 2: 110, 231
7. 151: 147
7. 152. 3: 143, 219
7. 171: 247
7. 173. 4: 184 n. 19
7. 183. 1: 184 n. 19
7. 204: 22, 231, 252–3
7. 207: 184 n. 19
7. 219. 2: 184 n. 19
7. 233. 2: 148 n. 28
8. 1: 182
8. 3. 2: 197

8. 4–5: 181–3
8. 4. 2: 184 n. 19
8. 5. 2: 182 n. 11
8. 14: 183
8. 14. 1: 185 n. 25
8. 16: 183
8. 16. 3: 185 n. 25
8. 18: 183, 184 n. 19
8. 19: 184
8. 20: 185 n. 23, 188 n. 37
8. 23. 1: 185 n. 25
8. 24–5: 183 n. 16
8. 44: 202 n. 5
8. 49. 2: 184 n. 19
8. 56: 184 n. 19
8. 57: 184 n. 19, 195 n. 65
8. 64: 57
8. 66. 2: 186 n. 28, 191 n. 53
8. 67. 1: 194 n. 59
8. 74. 2: 184 n. 19
8. 75: 195
8. 75. 2: 184 n. 19
8. 76. 2: 185 n. 25
8. 79–81: 195 n. 65
8. 83–4: 57
8. 104: 172
8. 111–12: 189
8. 111. 2: 190 nn. 43, 47
8. 111. 3: 190, 237
8. 112. 1: 190 n. 46
8. 112. 2: 186 n. 28, 194 n. 59
8. 112. 3: 190 n. 45
8. 121. 1: 193 n. 57
8. 123–5: 197 n. 70
8. 131: 22, 252–3
8. 131. 2: 231
8. 137–9: 204
8. 137. 1: 231
8. 139: 22, 204, 231
9. 16: 151 n. 36
9. 22. 2: 163 n. 3
9. 97: 93 n. 85

Hesiod
Fragments
1. 6–7 MW: 74 n. 21
7 MW: 304 n. 80
10a MW: 90 n. 75
11. 7 MW: 85 n. 50
12 MW: 85 n. 50
14. 3 MW: 85 n. 50
25. 14 MW: 85 n. 50
43a MW: 76
70 MW: 76
127 MW: 82 n. 39
150–7 MW: 76
190a MW: 75
200–4 MW: 75
204 MW: 74, 228 n. 30
215 MW: 74, 122 n. 19
224 MW: 76
233 MW: 90 n. 75
239 MW: 85 n. 53
241 MW: 123 n.21
253 MW: 123 n. 21
263 MW: 114
296 MW: 186 n. 30
Theogony
26–8: 81, 102
287 ff.: 86 n. 58
Works and Days
202–12: 164
633–40: 75
650–5: 75
655: 106 n. 20

Hippys of Rhegion
554 F 1: 117 n. 4

Homer
Iliad
2. 681–5: 270
6. 152 ff.: 92 n. 80
7. 76: 80 n. 34
13. 449–52: 247 n. 27
14. 115 ff.: 85 n. 50
20. 213 ff.: 92 n. 80
Odyssey
1. 325 ff.: 106 n. 19
8. 254 ff.: 106 n. 19
8. 488–91: 62
8. 499 ff.: 106 n. 19
8. 520: 164
11. 106–15: 185 n. 24
12. 260–425: 185

Ion of Chios
392 F 1: 111, 249 n. 35

Lysias
2. 31: 183 n. 18

Mimnermus
9 W: 49, 61
13 W: 48 n. 10
13a W: 48 n. 9
14 W: 48 n. 12, 63, 64

Nicolaus of Damascus
90 F 44. 7: 249 n. 37

Pausanias
1. 25. 1: 303 n. 75
2. 17. 3: 257 n. 67
3. 7. 2: 22 n. 19
10. 38. 1: 85 n. 50
Pherecydes of Athens
3 F 1: 114
3 F 2: 89 n. 71, 114 n. 34, 199
3 F 27: 114
3 F 38: 114 n. 34
3 F 39: 114
3 F 57: 123 n. 20
3 F 58: 122 n. 17, 123 n. 20
3 F 59: 89 n. 71, 114 n. 34
3 F 66: 111, 114
3 F 95: 114
3 F 101: 114
3 F 111: 114
3 F 135: 114
3 F 146: 111, 114
3 F 156: 111
3 F 167: 89 n. 71
3 F 168: 111, 114
Pherecydes of Syros
68 Schibli: 113 n. 31
Philochorus
328 F 130: 187 n. 32
Pindar
Fragments
77 Snell–Maehler: 183 n. 18
Nemean 6
45: 157
Pythian 1
94: 157
Pythian 4
3–6: 135
5–8: 128 n. 45
5–11: 128 n. 46
6–11: 135
9–10: 135
10: 124 n. 27
19–20: 135
44–53: 128 n. 46
47–9: 124 n. 27
53 ff.: 135
53–6: 128 n. 45
59–62: 117 n. 4
59–60: 128 n. 45
63: 135
256 ff.: 135
259–60: 128 n. 45
Pythian 5
60–2: 128 n. 45
73 ff.: 135
79–81: 119 n. 12
93–5: 121 n. 15
Plato
Alcibiades I
121 A: 199
Leges
4, 704 B–C: 294 n. 42
8, 848 D: 294 n. 42
9, 860 E: 294 n. 42
11, 919 D: 294 n. 42
12, 969 A: 294 n. 42
Phaedo
61 D 3–62 A 1: 277–8
Phaedrus
274 B 6 ff.: 173 n. 15
Timaeus
23 A: 154
19 E: 154 n. 41
22 A–B: 154 n. 41
Plutarch
Cimon
14. 3: 192 n. 56
De Herotodi malignitate
20: 249 n. 38
34: 183 n. 18
40: 139 n. 5
Lycurgus
1. 3: 253
Pericles
11. 5: 191 n. 50
22–3: 187 n. 34
23. 3: 188 n. 37
23. 4: 184 n. 20
Themistocles
23. 4: 193 n. 58
Polybius
12 .11. 1: 253, 259

Simonides
1–4 W: 54
3 W: 57
5 W: 55
6–9 W: 55
10–18 W: 55
11 W: 54–5, 57, 63
14 W: 56
16 W: 54
109 Diehl=xxiv Page: 183 n. 18

Solon
1–3 W: 61
1 W: 47 n. 7
4a W: 76
20 W: 107
Strabo
12. 8. 14: 293 n. 39
14. 1. 39: 292 n. 33
15. 3. 18: 36 n. 43

Tacitus
Annales
3. 62. 1: 294 n. 46
Thales
11 A 1: 78 n. 28
Thucydides
1. 1–21: 65
1. 1. 1: 283
1. 1. 2: 283
1. 1. 3: 264, 274, 279, 281, 283, 285
1. 2. 1: 274
1. 2. 3: 269, 283
1. 3. 1: 274, 283
1. 3. 2: 274
1. 3. 4: 283
1. 4: 274
1. 5. 2: 270
1. 5. 3–4: 270
1. 6. 3: 270
1. 6. 5–6: 271
1. 6. 6: 268
1. 7: 271
1. 8: 271
1. 9. 1: 272, 274
1. 9. 2: 271, 274
1. 9. 3–4: 271, 274
1. 10: 268
1. 10. 1–3: 275
1. 10. 3–5: 271
1. 10. 3: 274, 280, 283, 284
1. 10. 4–5: 275
1. 11: 271
1. 11. 1: 272, 274
1. 11. 2: 283
1. 12. 3: 269, 272
1. 12. 4: 272
1. 13–14: 267
1. 13. 2–5: 272
1. 13. 2: 275
1. 13. 6: 273
1. 14. 1: 274, 283
1. 14. 2: 273
1. 14. 3: 283
1. 15–17: 273
1. 15. 2: 283
1. 15. 3: 275
1. 16: 275
1. 17: 283
1. 18: 285
1. 18. 1: 274
1. 19: 283
1. 19. 4: 274 n. 28
1. 20: 265, 268, 274
1. 20. 1: 151
1. 21: 25, 265
1. 21. 1–2: 276
1. 21. 1: 267, 274, 275, 279–80, 284–5
1. 21. 2: 283
1. 22: 65, 106, 265, 279
1. 22. 2: 158
1. 22. 4: 63 n. 45, 278, 285
1. 23: 265–6, 283
1. 23. 3: 280, 285
1. 24: 266
1. 77. 3–4: 190
1. 97: 259–60
1. 114. 3: 184 n. 20, 188 n. 37
2. 1: 261
2. 2. 1: 261
2. 6: 148
2. 9: 255
2. 14. 1: 186 n. 31
2. 41. 4–5: 63 n. 45
3. 8: 259 n. 80
3. 98. 5: 192 n. 56
3. 104. 2: 273
4. 65. 4: 192 n. 56
4. 92. 4: 187 n. 32
4. 133: 255
5. 20: 260–1
5. 26: 261
5. 49: 259 n. 80
5. 68. 2: 156
5. 81: 255
5. 84–114: 190 n. 48
6. 1. 1: 267
6. 1. 2: 267
6. 3–5: 266
6. 6. 1: 266–7
6. 53. 3–60. 1: 281–2
6. 54. 1: 281
6. 76. 2: 187 n. 32
7. 28. 1: 186 n. 31
7. 48. 3–4: 192 n. 56
8. 96. 1–2: 186 n. 31

Tyrtaeus
1 W: 46 n. 2
2 W: 46 n. 3, 49, 56, 57
4 W: 46 n. 5, 56
5 W: 47 n. 6, 64, 65

Vitruvius
7 *praef.* 12: 290 n. 14

Xanthus
765 F 18: 38 n. 48
765 F 31–2: 43 n. 59

Xenophon
Hellenica
3. 2. 19: 289 n. 12
4. 8. 17: 289 n. 12

Zosimus
5. 6. 2: 303 n. 76

General Index

Achaemenes 231
Achilles 58
Acusilaus 89–90, 96–7, 104–5, 112, 114–15 and n. 34, 256, 257
Aegina 203–4
Aeneas 248
Aeschylus 301, 322
Aesop 25
Agamemnon 271
Agiads 231; *see also* Spartan king-lists
Alcmaeonid tradition 29–30, 167–8, 181
Alexander I the Philhellene 29, 172, 180, 204, 231
Aly, W. 11, 18
Amazons 302
Anaximander 85
Andros 189–90
annalistic pattern 241 and n. 2, 244–6, 249–51, 253–4, 261
Anysis 225
Apollodorus 253
Archilochus 51–2, 58–60, 61–2, 64
Argos, Argives 53, 112, 255–9
aristocratic tradition 27, 29
Aristogeiton 281
Asius of Samos 104
Assmann, J. 14, 77–8, 317
Assyria, Assyrians 231–4
Athens, Athenians 179–97, 203–4, 274, 281, 301–3
Atreus 271

Babylon, Babylonians 165–8
Battus 121 and n. 15, 128–9
Boeotia, Boeotians 269, 272

Caria, Carians 270–1
Carian mercenaries in Egypt 28, 232, 238
Charon of Lampsacus 194, 249–50
Cheops 225–6
Chephren 225–6
Chios, Chians 111–12
Choerilus of Samos 106
Chorasmia, Chorasmians 173–4
chronicles 244, 253–4, 319
chronography 242–8, 251
chronology 65, 89–94, 199–200, 207–10, 218–35, 319–20
Cinaethon of Lacedaemon 104
collective identity 129, 286, 289, 296–8, 301–3, 304, 307–8
collective memory 317, 321
Corcyra 204
Corinth 19, 30, 34, 204, 272, 317
Crete, Cretans 293–4
Croesus 162–3, 213
Croton 117–18
Ctesias 42
Cylon 202, 204
Cypselus 31, 201, 317
Cyrene 19, 117–37

Darius 173–8
Dark Ages 19–20, 235 n. 42, 320
Delian League 186, 196–7
Delphi, Delphic tradition 31–2, 130–2, 293
Delphic oracles 117–18, 125–6, 130–1, 287, 292
Demaratus 172
Diels, H. 138–9
Dionysius of Halicarnassus 70–1, 246–8, 249
Dionysus 229
documentary model 37, 253–4, 262, 318

Egypt, Egyptians 28–9, 146, 151–4, 202–3, 206–10, 211–40, 320
Egyptian priests 145, 153–4, 208, 213–14, 217, 219, 221, 227–8
epic cycle 274–5
epic poetry 22, 34, 113–14, 283–4
Epimenides 105 n. 17
eponymous magistrates 241–2, 244, 258

Eratosthenes 253
Euboea, Euboeans 182–9
Eugammon of Cyrene 123 and nn. 22–3
Eurypontids 231, 235; *see also* Spartan king-lists

family traditions 150–1, 200
Fehling, D. 27 n. 48, 139–40, 144, 147–8, 163, 172, 318, 321
Flavius Josephus 72
Finley, M. I. 19, 27, 275–6
Finnegan, R. 18, 21–2, 23–4
floating gap 198–203, 205–7, 209–10, 320
folk tale 11, 32–4, 40, 121, 131, 167, 177–8, 317; *see also* popular tradition

genealogies 22, 73–6, 78, 91, 93–4, 103–5, 124–5, 200, 229–30, 235, 250–1, 262
Goody, J. 37, 67–9, 127, 315
Greek mercenaries in Egypt 28, 232, 238
group memory 25, 27, 116–20, 149–50, 317
Gyges 43

Halbwachs, M. 317
Harmodius 281
Harpagus 38
Hecataeus 5–6, 22, 25, 76–94, 96–7, 101–5, 110–11, 114, 138–9, 159–60, 208–9, 221, 228, 235, 242, 319
Hellanicus 97, 105, 112, 115, 243–8, 250–1, 254–62, 268, 320
  Atthis 245, 254, 259–60
  Hiereiai 97, 243, 245, 246–8, 254–61
  Karneonikai 245–6
  Phoronis 256
  Troika 250
Hellen 269, 292, 304–5
Henige, D. 200, 208, 252
Heracles 52, 214, 216, 218, 223–5, 228–30, 232–5, 252
Heraclids of Lydia 230–3
Hermotimus 172
Heropythus the Chian 91
Hesiod 62, 68, 81–2, 102–4, 106–7, 211, 268–9, 300
  Catalogue of Women 73–6, 96, 103, 113, 122–3, 256
  Theogony 81
  Works and Days 74, 75, 164
Hipparchus 274, 280–2
Hippias of Elis 320
Hippias the son of Pisistratus 274, 281
Histiaea, Histiaeans 182–4
Histiaeus 32
Homer, Homeric poems 62, 63–4, 68, 75, 82, 107, 164–5, 206, 211, 267–8, 270–2, 285, 300, 323
  Catalogue of Ships 271–2, 275, 284
homoeostasis 127–9
horography, horographers 242–5, 248
Hyperboreans 145

implied audience of early Greek historiography 108–13
implied audience of Greek lyric poetry 109–10
Intaphernes 174–6
intentional history 119, 286, 297–9, 301, 303–6, 308–9, 312–13
Io 257
Ion of Chios 49, 96, 111–12, 249
ἱστορίη 18, 24, 97–8, 100, 141–2, 151–2, 298

Jacoby, F. 4–10, 26, 80–1, 133, 139–40, 158, 242–8, 257–8, 318–19

Kallithoe/Kallithya 256–7

Lake Moeris 217–18, 236–7
Lelantine war 275
Leucippus 292, 297
literacy 37, 67–70, 98–100, 115, 315
local history 95–8
λόγιοι ἄνδρες 6–7 and n. 11, 26–7, 35, 40, 152–3, 156–9, 207, 213–15
λογογράφοι 265, 268, 272, 284–5
λόγος 24–5, 67, 322, 325
Lycurgus 201–2
Lydia, Lydians 162–3, 230–4

Mcluhan, M. 315
Magnesia on the Maeander 287–97
Marathon 302–3, 310–12
Media, Medians 38, 231, 233
Memphis 217
Mermnads 231, 233
Milesian philosophers 78–80, 211
Miltiades 191–2
Mimnermus 47–50, 56, 57, 61, 62–3

Min 213, 215, 217–19, 221–2, 224, 227, 236–7
Minos 247, 267, 270, 274
Moeris 203, 218, 220, 222–5, 227, 233, 237–8
Momigliano, A. 8, 35, 133, 314–15
Mycerinus 226

Naucratis 28–9
Nicolaus of Damascus 249
Nile 215, 217, 236–9
Ninus 231, 233

Odysseus 185
Olympic victors 256, 259, 320
oracles 126, 188–9, 291; *see also* Delphic oracle
oral tradition 8–11, 13–15, 16–44, 127–33, 135–7, 198, 205–7, 254, 257, 279–80, 282, 285, 316–18, 321, 324–5
orality 2–4, 67–70, 98–100, 105–6, 115, 120–4, 314

Pan 229
Panyassis 49–50, 60–1
Pausanias 257
Pelasgians 87–9, 159–60, 202, 206
Peloponnesian war 265, 283–4
Pelops 271
Perdiccas 204
Pericles 187
Perses 231
Persia, Persians, Persian tradition 35–44, 155–6, 162–3, 173–8, 231, 315
Persian wars 266, 302–4, 310–12
Phaleas of Chalcedon 167
Pherecydes of Athens 88, 89, 91–2, 94, 96–7, 104, 114
Pherecydes of Syrus 79
Pheron 223, 225–6
Philaid tradition 30, 88
Phoroneus 256
Pindar 123–5, 128–9, 135–6
Plato 154, 173, 277–9, 299
Plutarch 139, 259
Polycrates 32, 204, 270, 273
popular tradition 163
priestly tradition 36
prose writing 78–9, 103
Proteus 223–6, 233
Psammetichus 203, 213, 215, 217, 223, 227, 232, 238–9

rationalization of myths 84–9, 101
Reinhardt, K. 41–4
remembrancers 26, 316
retaliation 203–6
rhapsodes 106
Rome 248

Sabacus 226
Sacadas 53
Salamis 302
Samos 21, 204
scribal tradition 253–4
Scythia, Scythians 154–5, 168–73, 203, 231
Semonides 49, 54 n. 29, 62
Sesostris 222, 224, 226, 233
Sethus 220, 224, 227, 233
Sicily 273, 290
Sicyon 258–9
Simonides:
  Artemisium poem 57
  elegy for Plataea 13, 54–8, 63, 65, 321
social surface 135, 137, 159 and n. 54, 286, 298, 308
Socrates 277–8
Solon 61
source references in early Greek historiography 139–40, 143–7
Sparta, Spartans 150, 156, 201–2, 204, 206, 268, 271, 282
Spartan king-lists 252–3, 256
speeches in poetry 65
Stesimbrotus of Thasos 194

Temenus 231
Thebes 217
Themistocles 180–97
Thessaly, Thessalians 269, 292
Thucydides 20, 31, 151, 158, 241, 255, 259–61, 320
  Archaeology 263–85
  Sicilian Archaeology 266–7
Timaeus of Tauromoenium 253, 259
Timocreon of Rhodes 193–4
Tiryns 256–7
Trojan war 223–6, 228, 233, 235, 246–7, 256, 266, 267–8, 274, 284, 299
Tymnes 154–5
Tyrtaeus 46–7, 50, 61, 65

universal history 236

Vansina, J. 10, 13–15, 18–19, 21, 23, 127–8, 316, 321

written records 23, 36, 69–72, 153–4, 220, 247, 254, 319

Xanthus the Lydian 43 and n. 59, 249
Xenophanes 49–50, 78, 81, 94
Xenophon 41–2

Zopyrus 39 and n. 51